BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08632 868 7

No. 7548.11

THE TRUSTEES OF THE
PUBLIC LIBRARY
OMNIVM
LVX
CIVIVM
OF THE CITY OF
BOSTON
1852 1878

Boston Public Library

Do not write in this book or mark it with pen or pencil. Penalties for so doing are imposed by the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This book was issued to the borrower on the date last stamped below.

FORM NO. 609: 3.9.31: 415M.

ORGANIC CHRISTIANITY;

OR,

THE CHURCH OF GOD,

WITH

ITS OFFICERS AND GOVERNMENT, AND ITS DIVISIONS AND VARIATIONS, BOTH IN ANCIENT, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN TIMES.

EMBRACING

A THOROUGH EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF CHURCH DEMOCRACY.

BY

LEICESTER A. SAWYER.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. JEWETT AND COMPANY.
CLEVELAND, OHIO:
JEWETT, PROCTOR & WORTHINGTON.
NEW YORK: SHELDON, LAMPORT & BLAKEMAN.
1854.

226.828
Amer. Lib.
July 12/77

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by
LEICESTER A. SAWYER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

STEREOTYPED BY
HOBART & ROBBINS,
New England Type and Stereotype Foundry,
BOSTON.

INTRODUCTION.

THE author has bestowed much labor on this work, and hopes it will be found a valuable contribution to the literature of the times. The work was begun some years since, with a view to furnish a text-book for the study of *Ecclesialogy* and *Church Polity* in theological seminaries. It embraces a critical examination of the church, as instituted by its divine founder, and as it was administered and extended by the apostles. This occupies the First Part. The Second Part relates to the churches of the first five hundred years after the age of the apostles, and describes the gradual rise of the Episcopacy and Papacy in the West, and the Episcopacy and Patriarchy in the East, together with Monachism, and other deviations from apostolic usage. Part Third relates to the Patriarchal and Papal churches, and exhibits concisely their principles and polities, demonstrating their great corruptions, and their incompetency to meet the demands of weak, erring and suffering humanity, and to accomplish its renovation and necessary improvement. Part Fourth relates to the revolutionary churches of modern times: the Lutheran church, the church of England, the Episcopal church of the United States, the Methodist Episcopal churches, the Presbyterian churches, the Congregational churches, and several minor sects. Presbyterianism

and Congregationalism are examined with particular care, and their history minutely traced.

The whole is believed to be a more complete and thorough system of Ecclesiology and Church Polity than has heretofore been published.

The subject is one of general interest and importance; and demands the thorough examination of ministers of the Gospel, of all orders. Set as they are for the exposition and defence of Christianity, they ought to know *precisely* what it is, and to expound it correctly. If they suffer themselves to be misled, in regard to its doctrines or polity, and teach men wrong, they may do great harm. Teaching contradictory doctrines, as they do, they cannot all be right. If the abettors of church despotisms are correct, those of church democracies must be wrong; and if the abettors of church democracies are right, those of church despotisms *must* be wrong. Let us know the truth, and teach it. For a minister not to know it, is to be guilty of gross and criminal negligence. The most expedient and scriptural polity for the church is not a matter of opinion only. It is a matter of knowledge; and those who will inquire accurately, may understand it; all uncertainty may be removed, and all doubts dispelled. A knowledge of this subject is important for the membership. They ought to know their office and responsibilities, and what God demands at their hands; how much they have to do in prosecuting the world's redemption, and what responsibilities they have to meet.

Very considerable attention is being given to the subject of the proper constitution and character of the church, of late, both in Europe and America. It is the great religious and moral question of Great Britain, and is keenly debated in some of the ablest periodicals of that nation. It is one

BOSTON. ASSOCIATION.

of the great questions in Germany, and is eliciting much discussion there. It agitates the different religious denominations in America, and divides the members in opinion. It is the greatest question of the times, and demands a more thorough discussion than it has yet received. The present work is an endeavor to meet this demand, and to give utterance to sound and scriptural views on the subject.

The church does not yet answer the idea of its divine founder; it does not fully meet the exigencies of the human race. It has fallen, somewhat, from its high position under the apostles, and must be restored to the point from which it has fallen. It can be restored. It will be. And set as the author is, in common with the rest of the accredited ministers of Christianity, for the promotion of the utmost purity and power of religion, he desires to contribute to that end by calling general attention to the subject of church polity, and showing the evident and most pernicious defects and errors of several prevailing systems. Not a little has been done to improve and beautify the church in modern times. Not a little is now being done. But the church waits to be still further improved and beautified, and still more perfectly adapted to its divine mission of blessing and benefitting the world, by being brought back perfectly to its scriptural model. According to the pattern shown in the mount, let the sacred tabernacle be made. The Bible ought to be examined on this subject, and its doctrines settled with respect to it. History, too, has its voice, and ought to be allowed to speak, and tell what it knows.

It is time that the experience of ages was turned to some account in the illustration of the principles of church organization. Different systems have long been experimented upon, and their capabilities tested. The system of Patri-

archy is fully tested in the East; that of Popery in the West. Episcopacy has also been fully tried; so has Presbyterianism; and so has Congregationalism. The different results of all these different systems have been wrought out, and are before the world, for its warning and instruction. Some of their decisive teachings are illustrated in these pages, and brought to bear on the argument in favor of church liberty and democracy.

Several authorities are referred to in the course of the work. Murdock's Mosheim, Gieseler, Neander, Milman, the Encyclopedia Americana, the other encyclopedias, the English and American reviews, and the early Christian fathers, have been extensively consulted and used, and great pains has been taken to determine the exact truth with regard to obscure and difficult subjects. All authorities have to be sifted, both the ancient and modern; and the author has endeavored to perform this part of his duty with the most scrupulous fidelity. He has had no interest in the matter but the interest of truth itself; and, by the grace of God, has felt no disposition to set down aught in malice on the one hand, or sectarian favoritism on the other.

The work expects to find friends and to meet with favor; but it has made no sacrifices of truth for the purpose of conciliating its enemies. The subjects of blind conservatism, and the great sticklers for the authority of councils and creeds, against reason, against truth and against the Scriptures themselves, this work must mortally offend. It has no sympathy with them, but regards them as the blind Pharisees of Christianity, and the most dangerous enemies of God and the human race. But the lovers of Christ himself, and of scriptural Christianity, those that meet God in his word, and that recognize him in his church and world, and that

are instructed not in the dead letter which killeth, but in the spirit which giveth life, this book hopes to greatly please and refresh. The author is a thorough progressive, and addresses himself to the friends of progress, with whom he hopes to find favor. Deo sit gloria.

Boston, July 20, 1854.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE POLITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH UNDER CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

	PAGE
NATURE and Origin of the Church,	13
Its System of Polity,	21
Peculiarities of Primitive Church Order,	28
Principles of Church Extension,	31
Church Revolutionism,	35
The Prime Minister of the Church,	38
The Apostles,	39
History of Peter,	44
Eldership of the Apostles,	51
Bishops and Presbyters,	53
The Heavenly Presbyters,	62
Arguments for Prelacy,	65
Deacons,	68
Nature of the Church Ministry,	80
General Conclusions respecting the Church under the Apostles,	83

PART II.

THE POST-APOSTOLIC CHURCH; OR THE CHURCH AFTER THE APOSTLES, FROM A. D. 100 TILL 606.

The Great Experiment: the Rise of Diocesan Episcopacy,	95
Provincial Councils and their Effect,	102
General Councils,	104
Monachism,	108

PAGE
Progress of the Hierarchy, ... 112
The Lights of the Post-Apostolic Church, ... 121
Controversies of the Post-Apostolic Church, ... 126
A Comparison of the Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Churches, . . 129

PART III.

THE PATRIARCHAL AND PAPAL CHURCHES.

DIVISION I.

THE PATRIARCHAL CHURCHES.

The Greek Church, ... 131
The Nestorian or Syrian Church, ... 136
The Armenian Church, ... 139
The Coptic Church, ... 142
The Abyssinian Church, ... 143
The Inefficiency of Eastern Christianity, and its Radical Vices, . . 145

DIVISION II.

THE PAPAL CHURCH.

General View of the Papal Church, and its Hierarchy, . . 152
The Pope, ... 154
The Cardinals, ... 156
The Provincial, Diocesan and Parochial Clergy, . . . 158
Doctrines and Usages of the Papal Church, ... 161
The Despotic Character of the Papacy, ... 166

PART IV.

REVOLUTIONARY CHURCHES.

DIVISION I.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

Precursors of the Protestant Reformation, ... 177
The Rise of Lutheranism, ... 180
The Lutheran System of Church Polity, ... 183

DIVISION II.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

PAGE
The Origin of the Church of England, ... 189
Officers of the Church of England, ... 193
Polity and Revenues of the Church of England, . . . 198
Parties in the Church of England, ... 202

DIVISION III.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

Origin of the Protestant Episcopal Church, ... 208
The Episcopal Ministry, ... 210
Episcopal Church Courts, ... 212
The Character of American Episcopacy, ... 216
Episcopalian Conservatism and Exclusiveness, . . . 218

DIVISION IV.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

The Origin of Methodism, ... 223
The Methodist Clergy, ... 227
The Methodist Church Courts, ... 229
The Methodist Itineracy, ... 232
General Views and Estimates of Methodism, . . . 234
The Theology of Methodism, and its Practical Effect, . . 236

DIVISION V.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

General View of Presbyterian Churches, ... 239
Presbyterian Church Courts, ... 242
The Principles of Presbyterianism, ... 247
The Origin of Presbyterianism in Switzerland, and its Founders, . 252
Presbyterianism in France, ... 258
Presbyterianism in Holland, ... 268
The Waldenses, ... 274
Presbyterianism in England, ... 275
The Westminster Assembly, ... 286
Presbyterianism in Scotland, ... 297
The Free Church of Scotland, ... 308

PAGE

Presbyterianism in the United States — its Introduction and General History, ... 318
Old and New School Presbyterianism, ... 327
Critical Position of New School Presbyterianism, ... 342

DIVISION VI.

THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

Congregationalism and its Officers, ... 347
Congregational Church Courts, ... 359
Associations of Ministers, ... 364
Congregational Synods and Conventions, ... 367
The Origin of Congregationalism, and its History in England, . 374
Introduction of Congregationalism in America, ... 387
The Progress and Fruits of Congregationalism in America, . . 395
Congregational Constitutions and Confessions of Faith, . . 402
Parties in the Congregational Church, ... 410
The Corruption of Congregationalism, ... 414
Confederations of Congregationalists, ... 419
Baptist Congregationalism, ... 422
The Achievements and Prospects of Congregationalism, . . 429

DIVISION VII.

MINOR DENOMINATIONS.

The United Brethren or Moravians, and Quakers, . . 439
The Unitarians and Christians, ... 444
The Swedenborgians, and Latter-day Saints, . . . 448

PART I.

THE POLITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH UNDER CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH.

Εκκλησια, Church, from *εκκαλεω*, to call, to call together, corresponds to the Hebrew קָהַל, and signifies,

1. A convocation, an assembly, a congregation. The disorderly assembly at Ephesus, described in Acts 19: 24—41, is called, in verses 32 and 40, an *εκκλησια*, *ecclesia*. The name is applied, in verse 39, to a lawful *assembly*, *εννομω εκκλησια*.

2. The people of God under the Mosaic dispensation. Acts 7: 38. — "This is he that was with the *εκκλησια*, church, in the wilderness." The general assemblies, in an especial manner, were called by this name. — Septuagint, Deut. 18: 16; 2 Chron. 1: 3, 5; 1 Macc. 2: 56; 4: 59.

3. An assembly of Christians, a Christian congregation. 1 Cor. 11: 18. — "For first I hear that when ye are come together in *εκκλησια*, meeting (in an assembly), there are divisions among you, and I partly believe it."

4. A Christian church, a society of Christians ordinarily meeting in the same congregation, and residing in the same place.

The church at Jerusalem. Acts 2: 4, 7. — And the Lord

added the saved daily to the *church*. 5 : 11. — And there was great fear upon all the *church*, and upon all that heard these things. 8 : 1. — At that time there was a great persecution against the church at Jerusalem. 11 : 22. — And tidings of these things came to the ears of the church in Jerusalem. And they (the church) sent forth Barnabas to go as far as to Antioch. 15 : 4. — And when they arrived at Jerusalem, they were received by the *church*, and the apostles and the presbyters, and related what things God had done with them. Verse 22. — Then it seemed good to the apostles and the presbyters, with the *whole church*, to send chosen men of themselves to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; (namely) Jude called Barnabas, and Silas, leaders among the brethren.

The church at Antioch. 11 : 26. — "And it came to pass that for a whole year they met with the church (at Antioch) and taught many, and the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch." A. D. 41. 13 : 1. — "Now there were at Antioch in the church certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simon called Niger, Luke the Cyrenean, and Manaen, foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch."

Other churches:

Rom. 16 : 1. — "I commend to you Phœbe our sister, who is deacon of the *church* in Cenchrea."

Verse 23. — "Gaius salutes you, who is my host, and host of the whole *church*" (at Corinth).

1 Cor. 1 : 2. — "To the church of God in Corinth, the sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints."

Col. 4 : 15. — "Salute the brethren in Laodicea and Nymphas and the church at his house;" that is, that meets at his house.

Verse 16. — "And when this epistle is read with you, cause that it may be read in the church of the Laodiceans."

Churches. 1 Cor. 4 : 17. — "For this reason I sent you Timothy, who is my beloved son and faithful in the Lord, who will remind you of my methods in Christ (in religion), as I teach

everywhere in every church." 7 : 17. — "But as our Lord has imparted to each one, and as God has called each one, so let him live, and so *διατασσομαι*, I *direct* in all the churches." 1 Thess. 2 : 14. — "For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which are in Judea, in Christ Jesus, because the same things which ye have suffered from your countrymen, they also have suffered from the Jews." Acts 9 : 31. — "Then had the churches rest through all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were built up; and, walking in the fear of the Lord and comfort of the Holy Spirit, were multiplied." 15 : 41. — "Paul went through Syria confirming the churches." 1 Cor. 16 : 1. — "As *διεταξα* I appointed to the churches of Galatia, so do ye." 2 Cor. 8 : 1. — "We inform you, brethren, of the grace given to the churches of Macedonia."

Mention is made of the seven churches of Ionia, in Asia Minor, in Rev. 1 : 4, with a specification of

1. The church in Ephesus. — Rev. 2 : 1.
2. The church in Smyrna. — Verse 8.
3. The church in Pergamos. — Verse 12.
4. The church in Thyatira. — Verse 18.
5. The church in Sardis. — 3 : 1.
6. The church in Philadelphia. — Verse 7.
7. The church in Laodicea. — Verse 14.

5. Besides denoting a congregational and local association of Christians, *εκκλησια* denotes the entire body of Christians on earth.

Matt. 16 : 18. — "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter (rock), and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." 1 Cor. 12 : 28. — "And God hath set in the church, first, apostles; second, prophets; third, teachers; then miraculous powers, then gifts of healing (medicinal powers), helps, governments, different languages."

Eph. 1 : 22, 23. — "And made him head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all things in all." Eph. 5 : 23—32; Phil. 3 : 6; Col. 1 : 17, 18.

— "He is before all things, and all things exist in him, and he is the head of the body the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that he might have the preëminence in all things." Eph. 5: 23—32; Phil. 3: 6.

Heb. 12: 22, 23. — "But you have come to Mount Zion, even the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads the general assembly of angels, and to the church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven, and to the judge and God of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect." Ecclesiasticus 24: 2. — "In the church of the Most High shall she (wisdom) open her mouth, and glory in the presence of his power."

This church is universal, the same as the Catholic church; but it is never referred to in the New Testament as under any general government, except that of Christ. There is no universal bishop, no general council, no supreme court. The universal church of the New Testament consists of the particular churches. But it does not appear as an organization in which the particular churches are made subject to a common central jurisdiction. The New Testament gives us no organization of the universal church into a single incorporation, no national churches, and no provincial churches; but simply congregational and city churches; societies of Christians belonging to single cities and other localities, and meeting to a great extent in the same assemblies for divine worship, and for the transaction of church business.

In modern times, the word *church* is applied to denote any society of the professed followers of Christ, however organized, and whatever principles of religion and morality it may hold: as, the Roman Catholic church, the Greek church, the Armenian church, the Nestorian church, the Coptic church, the Abyssinian church, and the Protestant churches of different orders. The highest order of Protestant churches is the national. Protestantism has no universal churches.

National Episcopal churches are divided into provincial

churches, provincial churches into dioceses, and dioceses into parochial churches or parishes. National Methodist Episcopal churches are divided into annual conferences, the annual conferences into circuits and stations, and the circuits and stations into classes of about twelve members. National Presbyterian churches are divided into presbyteries and local churches of single congregations.

Congregationalism does not allow of national churches under a single control or jurisdiction, though it admits of national associations of independent Congregational churches for mutual advice and counsel.

All men agree in referring the origin of the Christian church to Jesus Christ as its founder. But the precise constitution which he gave it, the offices which he established in it, the precise powers attached to those offices, and the elements which are essential to its genuineness as a church of Christ, and without which it is not a genuine Christian church, with a valid ministry and valid ordinances, — all these, and other points, are matters in regard to which there is a great diversity and contrariety of opinion among professing Christians, and that not only among the illiterate and the uninformed, but among the most eminent Christians and the most accomplished biblical scholars and theologians. And yet it is evident that, as far as light is to be had on this subject from the Scriptures, ancient history, and from the nature and operation of different principles and schemes, and their agreement or disagreement with the known principles and ends of the Creator, there ought to be agreement among candid and competent inquirers after truth; and beyond this the sphere of knowledge does not extend. All beyond this is baseless and unprofitable conjecture.

Let us, therefore, examine the institution of the church as it was organized by its divine founder, and modified and administered by the apostles with his express approbation, with a view to determine, as far as possible, the precise form and principles of its organization.

If there are doubtful and conjectural principles, which cannot be settled, there being no evidence to establish and none to refute them, let us mark them as *conjectural*, and hold them, if we hold them at all, only as such. But what can be known with *perfect certainty*, and *all* that can be known thus, let us learn and hold; and, having learned it, let us teach and support the same, and contribute what we can to its becoming an object of general knowledge with all liberal inquirers after truth.

The origin of the church dates from the commencement of Christ's public ministry. This is proved by the early institution and administration of Christian baptism. Christian baptism is a rite of *purification*, a symbol of moral cleansing, and a seal of consecration to Christ as his disciple and servant. Its origin marks the origin of the Christian society. The baptized were a society of professed Christians, and were made so by their baptism. The early institution of Christian baptism appears from the following Scripture testimonies:

John 3: 22. — "After these things, Jesus came with his disciples into the land of Judea, and there he abode with them and baptized." The followers of Christ are here spoken of as his disciples. They are also spoken of as a society by themselves. There he abode with his disciples, not with others. The title of disciples marks their acknowledgment of him as their master and teacher, and their submission to his authority.

It appears, from another testimony, not only that Christ admitted persons to *his church* — the society of his followers — by baptism, from the commencement of his public ministry, but that his admissions were quite numerous at this early period. John 3: 25, 26. — "There was a debate of the disciples of John with a Jew concerning (baptismal) purification. And they went to John, and said to him. Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond the Jordan, to whom thou didst bear witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." John 4: 1—3. — "When the Lord knew, therefore, that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John, though

Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples, he left Judea, and went again into Galilee." This was in A. D. 30.

It appears, therefore, that our Lord gained numerous followers in the early part of his ministry, and that he organized them into a religious society, acknowledging himself as its head, and had them baptized.

Baptism was a rite of purification analogous to the purifications by sprinkling and affusion under the Jewish law. Heb. 9: 9, 10. — "Which was a figure for the time then present, according to which gifts and sacrifices were offered, which were not able to make the worshipper perfect in respect to the conscience, consisting only in meats, and drinks, and διαφοροις βαπτισμοις, various baptisms, external ordinances, imposed till the time of reformation."

It was administered to believers on their making a public profession of their Christian faith. — Acts 8: 36, 37. This profession involved that of allegiance to Christ as the Messiah.

Hence baptism was said to be εις Χριστον to Christ, and εις θανατον αυτου to his death (Rom. 6: 3), importing that the subject was consecrated and set apart to Christ to follow him even to death. The primitive title of Christians was Μαθηται, disciples, that is, Christ's disciples; while the unbelieving Jews called themselves Moses' disciples. John 9: 28. — "And they reviled him, and said, Thou art his disciple, but we are Moses' disciples." They are also distinguished by the same title from the Pharisees and John's disciples. Mark 2: 18. — "The disciples of John and the Pharisees fast, and they come and say to him, Why do the disciples of John and those of the Pharisees fast, and thy disciples fast not?" — John 13: 35; 15: 8.

The society of Christ's disciples was not yet ordinarily spoken of under the title of a church. In Matt. 18: 17, it is spoken of under this title. — "If he will not hear them, tell it to the *church;* and if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and publican."

Its more common title was the kingdom of the heavens and

the kingdom of God. Matt. 3 : 2. — "The kingdom of the heavens is at hand." 4 : 23; 6 : 10. — "Thy kingdom come." 13 : 11. — "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens." Verses 24, 31, 33, 44, 47, 52; Luke 19 : 11; John 18 : 36. — "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom was of this world, my servants would have fought for me, that I should not have been given to the Jews." Luke 17 : 20, 21. — "Being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them, and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" (that is, with imposing array), "neither shall they say Behold it is here, or behold it is there. For behold the kingdom of God is among you."

The doctrine of the kingdom of the heavens and the kingdom of God on earth seems to have been taken from Dan. 7 : 18. — "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess it forever, even for ever and ever." Verse 27. — "And the kingdom and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." — Micah 4; Isa. 11 : 52, 53; Ps. 2 : 110.

This amazing kingdom of God and glory was organized by Christ, under the title of the kingdom of the heavens and of God. It continued to be preached and extended under these titles after the pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts 19 : 8; Col. 1 : 13), when they gradually fell into disuse, and were supplanted by the less imposing title of *the Christian church.* The above is in conformity with Bretschneider, Rosenmuller, Robinson, and the English and German interpreters generally. The Second Adventists contend for the restriction of this title to the church in its more perfect development, yet to be attained.

The sacrament of baptism was instituted, as we have seen, at the commencement of Christ's public ministry; that of the Lord's supper was added at the close. — Matt. 26 : 26—30;

Mark 14: 22—26; Luke 22: 19, 20. As baptism was a religious washing, symbolical of our moral cleansing, the Lord's supper was a religious supper, symbolical of our interest in Christ, and commemorative of his death.

The twelve apostles were chosen by Christ in the early part of his ministry, to act as preachers and expounders of Christianity, and were solemnly set apart by himself to the Gospel ministry in his church and kingdom. — Matt. 10: 1—42; Mark 3: 13—19; Luke 6: 13—16. They were mainly preachers and teachers, with full power to perpetuate the office of instruction in the church.

At a later period, seventy were added to the original twelve, and commissioned to take part in the work of preaching the Gospel. — Luke 10: 1—17.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRIMITIVE SYSTEM OF CHURCH POLITY.

There is no indication of the form of government adopted in the Christian church in the Gospels, except in Matt. 18: 15—17. — "If thy brother sin against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone. If he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. If he do not hear thee, take with thee one or two, that by the mouth of one or two witnesses every word may be established. But if he refuse to hear thee, tell it to the *church*. But if he refuse to hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and publican."

This, so far as discipline is concerned, is the government of the people by the people. The congregation is the church court, to which difficulties among the membership are to be brought; and not the church court only, but the *supreme church court* for the *final decision* of cases.

When James and John desired the highest offices in Christ's kingdom, it was said to the disciples, Matt. 20: 25, 26, "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and the great exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your διακονος, deacon (servant), and whosoever will be first among you, let him be your δουλος, slave (servant of the lowest class)."

It does not appear, from this, that jurisdiction had been given to the twelve apostles over the church as its masters and spiritual lords, nor that Christ ever designed to invest them with such authority; but the contrary.

These views are supported by Matt. 23: 8—12.—"Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your καθηγητης (master), but all ye are brethren. And call no man father on earth; for one is your Father who is in the heavens. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ. But the greatest of you shall be your διακονος (deacon); and whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

These two passages, Matt. 20: 25, 26, and 23: 8—12, are the key to the church polity instituted by Christ. They recognize the essential equality of Christians under the rule of Christ, their subjection to him alone as their Lord and Master, and to God alone as their Father; and entirely exclude any spiritual lordship of the apostles, or any one of them, over the church.

As all societies must have government of some kind, this denial of any lordship whatever to the apostles and Christian ministry requires the government to be vested in the membership, and makes the church a spiritual democracy, allowing an aggregation of such democracies in a Christian republic. According to this theory, the ministry of the church is not a ruling ministry, but a serving ministry; not an absolute spiritual magistracy, but a spiritual magistracy of limited powers; and the kingdom of Christ is not a kingdom of subjects under an absolute human sovereignty, but a kingdom of kings, under the

sovereignty of the King of kings, a kingdom of priests, not subject to an earthly prelatical priesthood, but subject to the supreme and unchanging priesthood of Christ alone.

There is a most sublime originality both in the moral instructions of Christ and in his institutions. He speaks as one having authority, but not as the Scribes. He is the founder of the church,

1. As a spiritual kingdom and society separate from the state, and having within its sphere independent jurisdiction.

2. As a kingdom subject to him alone as its supreme sovereign, in which all the organic powers of the spiritual government are vested equally in the entire people, to be exercised by them in their primary assemblies, or by delegates of their choice, representing them and acting by their authority.

The church government instituted by Christ was not a hierarchy, a government of priests; but a democracy, a government of the people. The apostles were not a governing order in the church, but mainly a teaching order.

It is supposed by some that the institution of the church is given us without a form and principles of government; that it is a scheme of religious association to which we have a right to add any government that we please, or that we judge expedient. But this is a mistake. A church without a government is a contradiction in terms. It takes organization to make a church, and organization is a provision for associated action. The church of Christ was an organization with provision for associated action. It was an organic body, constituted and prepared for action, and empowered to extend and perpetuate itself. As long as Christ was on earth, he was its acknowledged and visible head. After the ascension, it had no visible head on earth, but was in the condition of a kingdom whose sovereign is absent. It had an organization for the administration of its affairs, formed in agreement with the principles above specified, and was a spiritual democracy.

The church was not governed, after the departure of Christ,

by the apostles, as representatives and vicegerents of Christ; still less by the apostle Peter alone as his vicegerent; but it was governed by itself, by the entire membership, deliberating, debating and deciding, on public measures. This appears from the following indubitable evidences:

1. The appointment of the apostle Matthias. — Acts 1: 15—26. This measure is proposed by Peter in a meeting of the *disciples*, the membership, of about one hundred and twenty. And they appointed (two, probably those two having an equal number of votes), and decided between them by casting lots. The lot fell on Matthias, and he συγκατεψηφισθη, was voted among the twelve apostles.

This assembly represented the whole Christian church at the time, and probably had members from every part of the land of Israel. It was a meeting of disciples, not of ministers only.

2. The appointment of deacons. — Acts 6: 1—6. A trouble having arisen from irregularity in the distribution of church charities to the poor, in the church at Jerusalem, the twelve called the *multitude of the disciples together*, and proposed to them the appointment of seven deacons. The proposition pleased the *whole multitude*, and they chose them accordingly, and set them before the apostles, and the apostles ordained them.

Here, for the first time, we find the clergy and laity acting separately and conjointly in a church matter.

The apostles propose a measure, the brethren approve it; elect deacons, and set them before the apostles; and, finally, the apostles ordain and install them in their offices. The right to ordain, on the part of the ministry, implies a right to withhold ordination from improper candidates. Such a right involves a limitation of the power of the brethren, so as to require the concurrence of the preëxisting ministry in the appointment of ministers; but it does not justify ministerial absolutism.

3. The trial of Peter for preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, and admitting them to the church. — Acts 11: 1—18.

When the apostles and brethren who were in Judea heard

that the Gentiles had received the word of God, and when Peter had returned to Jerusalem, those of the circumcision contended with him, saying, You went in to men who were uncircumcised, and you eat with them. Peter explained the matter, and when they heard these things they were silent, and glorified God; saying, Truly, then, hath God granted to the Gentiles repentance to life.

This trial and the exposition by Peter appears to have been in a general meeting of the brethren at Jerusalem, and is a virtual concession to them of a right to know the reasons of his procedure, and competency to judge of the validity of those reasons. This was in A. D. 41.

4. The settlement of the controversy respecting circumcision in A. D. 52.

This controversy arose at Antioch, when certain men from Judea taught that circumcision was obligatory on Christians, and that there could be no salvation without it. This was a new doctrine in the Gentile churches, and excited great dissension. Paul and Barnabas opposed it, but were unable to satisfy the church. Whereupon it was agreed that they and others should go up to Jerusalem, to the apostles and presbyters, concerning this question. The persons who made this agreement were evidently the church at Antioch, and other Christians in that region. This appears both from the context and from v. 23, where the letter of the council at Jerusalem is addressed to the *brethren who are of the Gentiles.*

On the arrival of these delegates at Jerusalem, they were received by the church, by the apostles and the presbyters; and the apostles and presbyters came together to consider the matter. The question is debated long and earnestly. At length Peter gives his opinion against circumcision; then Barnabas and Paul give their opinions, all the multitude of the disciples paying particular attention to these powerful preachers. After that, James, who seems to have presided in the council, gives his opinion, in agreement with the opinions of Peter, Barnabas and Paul; and advised a decision of the council to that effect.

Then it pleased the apostles and presbyters, with the whole church, to send two commissioners to Antioch, with Barnabas and Paul, communicating their decision, which was adverse to circumcision; and they wrote a circular letter after this manner: "The apostles, presbyters and brethren, send greeting to the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. Forasmuch as we have heard that certain persons who went out from us have troubled you with words, perverting your minds, saying that ye must be circumcised and keep the law, whom we commanded not; it seemed good to us, *being assembled* and of one mind in regard to it, to send delegates to you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have exposed their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent, therefore, Judas and Silas, who will tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from things offered to idols, and from blood, from strangled meat, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye will do well. Farewell."

Here observe that this great question is not settled by the apostles, nor by the apostles and presbyters, but by the apostles, presbyters, and brethren. Of the brethren large numbers were present.—v. 12. Observe, too, that the decision was unanimous.—v. 25.

Now, what was this council at Jerusalem? It was not a general Presbyterian assembly, consisting of ministers and ruling presbyters; it was not an Episcopal general convention, consisting of bishops and presbyters, or of bishops, presbyters and delegates from parishes, voting in separate houses. It was a Congregational church meeting of the church in Jerusalem. Nor is this all. It was a Congregational church meeting, held as a court of reference on a question that had come up from the church at Antioch for advice, and that one of the great questions of the day.

The apostles did not decide this question by authority. They argued it, and the council decided it. The action is that of the

apostles, presbyters, and the whole church. — v. 22. The decision was of the highest importance. It related to a question of ecclesiastical law. If any question might have been taken from the church and given to the ministry, or from the ordinary ministers and referred to the apostles, this surely is one. But no; it must be decided by the church, the brotherhood.

5. The membership in the church judged concerning the qualifications of candidates for membership, and received or rejected applicants. This appears from Rom. 14: 1. — "Him that is weak in the faith receive (to the church), but not to doubtful disputations." This is a direction not to Roman presbyters, but to the Roman ἅγιοι *saints*, the entire church. — Rom. 1: 7.

6. The membership excommunicated offenders. 1 Cor. 5: 7. — Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new mass as ye are unleavened. V. 9, 11, 13. — Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person. This is not to the presbyters, but to the church at Corinth. — 1 Cor. 1: 2.

7. The membership were required to admonish and restore offenders.

Gal. 6: 1. — "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in any fault, do ye who are spiritual restore such a one, in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

We have one example of a council of presbyters without the membership, in Acts 21: 18—30. — "And the day following, Paul went with us to James, and all the presbyters were present. And when he had saluted them, he related particularly what things God had performed among the Gentiles, by his ministry. And when they heard, they glorified God. And they said to him, Thou seest, brother, how many ten thousands of Jews have believed, and they are all zealots of the law," &c.

This is simply an association of presbyters, with James as moderator of the meeting, called for the purpose of receiving Paul, hearing from him an account of his labors, and advising him with respect to the dangers with which he was surrounded, and the most likely method of avoiding them.

CHAPTER III.

PECULIARITIES OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH ORDER.

It does not appear that the constitutions of the first churches were written out. No record is made of any of them in the New Testament, and no vestige of any is preserved in the archives of antiquity.

The documents known in ecclesiastical history as the apostolic canons and constitutions were ascribed to Clement, a bishop of Rome, near the close of the first century. But they are the productions of a later writer, who probably lived in the third century; and appear to have been somewhat altered, probably in the fourth century. They belong to the class of pious frauds, which were quite numerous in the early ages, and cannot be admitted as valid evidences of apostolic principles and usages.

It does not appear that Christ dictated any general summary confession of faith, to be used by his churches, in the admission of members; nor do the apostles appear to have composed any. None is preserved, and probably none was written. Candidates appear to have made an extempore confession before the church to the satisfaction of the membership, and that in answer to questions. 1 Pet. 3: 21. — "As to which the antitype now saves us, not the putting off of the filth of the flesh, but the answer to God of a good conscience."

Without any elaborate written confessions, believers professed their perfect faith in Christ as the Messiah, the Son of God, and the Saviour of men; in the holy Scriptures as the word of God; in the Holy Spirit as the sanctifier and the spirit of truth; and in the Scripture doctrines of holiness in this life, and of a future state. All this, and much more, was comprehended in faith in Christ. To believe in Christ was to believe in the whole

system of Christianity. Nothing more than an explicit profession of faith in Christ appears to have been necessary to admission to the church. — Acts 8: 37; 16: 31—34.

The elaborate confessions of faith made use of by most denominations in modern times are a deviation from Christian and apostolic usage. They are meant to be improvements of the institutions of Christ, but they are really corruptions of them. Christ made no such standards, and required no subscriptions to them. Such standards would have materially impeded the progress of religion in the apostolic age, and they have always been injurious.

Had an elaborate and extended confession of Christian faith been necessary, such an instrument ought to have been given to the primitive church by its divine founder. As we may not add to the canon of God's inspired word, or take from it, and be blameless; so we may not add to the qualifications and requisitions for membership in his church. Even the weak in faith is to be received as far as may be. — Rom. 14: 1.

The omission of any extended confession of faith, to receive the assent of candidates for admission to the church, and the absence of an allusion to any, however remote, in the New Testament, ought forever to exclude them from the church, unless they are made of that general character which corresponds to the professions made by the first Christians with the sanction of Christ.

The effect of extended confessions of faith has been to create and perpetuate unnecessary divisions in the church of God, and to make allowable diversities of opinion, and such errors and imperfections of knowledge as are compatible with sincere piety and acceptable Christian obedience, a bar to church membership and communion.

This is wrong. The doors of the church ought to be open to all sincere Christians, however imperfect in knowledge. Christian faith is but another name for Christian knowledge; for knowledge of things made known to us by the testimony of the

word of God. Some believe more, and some less; as some know more, and some know less, in other departments of inquiry.

That amount of faith in divine things that was judged sufficient to entitle its subjects to membership and communion in the church by Christ and the apostles, ought to be sufficient now, and ought always to remain so. This will not hinder that knowledge should be progressive, and the membership in all churches should learn as much as possible.

The church of Christ had no connection with the state. It was an independent *spiritual community*, an institution complete in itself, without any state alliance. The civil magistrate did not appoint its ministers, convene its courts; ratify its articles of faith, whatever they may have been; did not form courts of appeal and review from the decisions of the church courts; did not collect the dues of presbyters and other church ministers, and had no connection with church affairs. As a member, he took his place with other members, and possessed no superiority over them.

The church was a religious state, a society independent of the state, and organized for religious purposes alone. It made its own laws, elected its own officers, and administered its own government.

It held its own courts for the trial of offences, and punished offenders with rebukes, suspensions and excommunications. It had no prisons, no dungeons, no chains, no instruments of torture and of death. It inflicted no corporal punishments. It retained the penitent offender who forsook his sins, and excommunicated the incorrigible.

Its principles and maxims were opposed to those of the principal civil governments under which it prevailed. It prohibited many things which they allowed, and commanded some things which they prohibited. This led to frequent and bloody persecutions; but persecution could not change its principles, or relax its discipline.

The church did not, ordinarily, engage in any controversy

with the state authorities under which it lived. But it everywhere carried with it the law of God as the supreme rule of moral action, and demanded of its members uncompromising obedience to it. When the civil magistrate interfered to enforce a law of the state against the law of God, the reply of the church was given in the sublime and unanswerable declaration of Peter and the other apostles, "We ought to obey God rather than man," — Acts 5: 29; and, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken to you more than unto God, judge ye," —4: 19.

CHAPTER IV.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH EXTENSION.

We have no account of city and local churches till after the conclusion of our Lord's public ministry. Then all the churches were city and local churches, and they all appear as independent bodies. The extension of the church was not by branches growing out of a common stock, and retaining their connection with it, like an enormous tree, that should have its roots at Jerusalem, and send its stock and branches to the ends of the earth, but by independent trees, each having separate roots, stems and branches, of its own, according to the analogy of the natural world. These trees might be raised, as in the natural world, by cuttings, or by the good seed of the Gospel. A branch might be cut off from a preëxisting church to form a new church, or a new church might be organized from new converts to the truth, without a solitary member from any previous church.

Neither is there any prescribed method of effecting the organization of churches, that must be adhered to in all cases. Most of the organizations described in the New Testament were made

by regularly-ordained ministers. It does not appear, however, that Paul ever had ordination from those that were ministers before him, except at his consecration to the work of a foreign missionary, after he had been some years in the ministry. Acts 13: 2, 3; Gal. 1: 15—24. — "But when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither did I go to Jerusalem to those who were apostles *before me;* but I went to Arabia, and returned again to Damascus. Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days."

The church of Rome seems to have been founded by laymen. Bunsen, Michaelis, Rambach, Rosenmuller and others, suppose that the church at Rome was founded by some of the Roman converts under Peter's preaching on the day of the great pentecostal blessing. Among his hearers were strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes. — Acts 2: 10.

The primitive churches were not close corporations, founded by charters and licenses from other churches; but general independent Christian societies, capable of being formed wherever a number of Christians were disposed to unite together for that purpose. They were voluntary societies, with no other written constitutions than the sacred Scriptures, and with no restrictions in respect to rights of conscience. They were generally organized by Christian ministers; but such agency was by no means necessary for this purpose. The essential things, in regard to such organizations, were, the principles on which they were organized. These were principles of perfect holiness, of perfect love to God, and equal love to all men; or, of liberty, justice and equality.

With no trace of a provincial, national, or universal organization, and no general government, it is natural to inquire what provision was made by the divine Founder of the church for preserving its essential unity and harmony. Was there any

adequate provision made for this purpose? and, if so, what was it?

On a superficial view, no provision whatever appears to have been made for the preservation of a general union and agreement of churches; but the general liberty and independence of churches, however small, seems to leave them exposed to endless diversities and divisions. They may depart from the faith; they may introduce new usages, and abandon old ones; they may apostatize from the most essential principles of Christianity, and adopt principles of impiety and superstition; and there is no human authority to restrain them. Is this right and expedient?

The post-apostolic fathers thought such an arrangement imperfect, and undertook to improve it. In attempting to make improvement, they first modified the primitive constitution of the church by gradually introducing diocesan and provincial episcopacy; and then matured and improved the episcopacy into the papacy in the West, and the patriarchates in the East. But, so far from saving the church from corruption by these improvements, they caused it to be overwhelmed. The patriarchates did not escape in the East; the papacy did not escape. Could it have been worse if the organization of Christ and the apostles had been left as they left it? I think not.

But is it a fact that no adequate provision was made, by the system of church polity established by Christ, for the perpetual preservation of the church, and for preserving an essential union and agreement among all its branches? I think not. Such neglect would have been a great oversight, unworthy of the divine Founder of Christianity.

The liberty and independence of congregational churches is the greatest and most effectual barrier possible against corruption both in doctrine and discipline, and affords the only possible condition of continual improvement and renovation.

This organization is based on the supposition that religion is a science, and can be safely left to its evidences; and that in

regard to its essential principles it lies within the sphere of ordinary human knowledge. How absurd would it be to establish councils and controlling organizations to protect schools of philosophy, and to bind their disciples, by oaths and pledges, to particular formulas of philosophic faith! Freedom of discussion, and the inherent excellence and superiority of truth, are sufficient guarantees for the protection and preservation of the sciences. Knowledge cannot be preserved and perpetuated by authority, it cannot be lost under a system of freedom. Why do we not establish organizations to preserve the Newtonian philosophy? to preserve the science of chemistry, of natural philosophy, of astronomy; and establish our superintendences to keep men everlastingly to the truth of these sciences? The method of freedom is better. It is as much better in the *science* of religion as it is in the secular sciences. A knowledge of spiritual things needs pledges and engagements, to keep men in its possession, as little as a knowledge of temporal things.

Uzzah was not allowed to put forth his hand to steady the ark of God when it seemed to jostle. How much less may human authority override the essential prerogatives and liberties of the human race, to save the great truths of religion from being ignored or rejected! Truth wants no such aid. God requires no such coöperation. He allows no such interference.

The weakness of God is stronger than men, and the foolishness of God wiser than men.

The church departed from its primitive organization to make its purity more secure, and its power more transcendent; and the result has been, universal and incurable corruption. Had it continued in its apostolic polity, it would, in all probability, have retained its purity and power, through all the dark ages of the past, to the present time. Truth would have had free course, and would have prevailed and have been glorified. The prosperity and liberty of the church would have reäcted on the state; and the great civil despotisms of mediæval and modern Christendom would never have existed.

CHAPTER V.

CHURCH REVOLUTIONISM.

All the improvements in the state of Christianity that have been effected in modern times have been effected by a more or less general return to the principles of church polity established by Christ.

The great movements of Luther in Germany, and of Zuingle in Switzerland, were based on the assumed right of the independent organization of Christian churches. The detachment of the church of England from that of Rome was based on the same assumption, and was only justified on principles that justify independent church organizations universally, as far as such organizations are deemed expedient.

All these movements were made not only without the authority of the church of Rome, but against its express prohibitions, and in defiance of its power.

Under ordinary circumstances, men ought not to preach without being duly authorized to do so by the church authorities, and churches should be organized with the advice and counsel of ministers. But, in cases where this regular institution cannot be conveniently attained, and where, in the opinion of Christians, the interests of religion imperatively demand such institution by other means, it is the right of individual Christians to unite on the basis of a common faith in Christ, as a Christian church; and, having done so, to institute a church ministry, agreeably to the New Testament examples and directions on this subject.

Such a procedure is justified by the example of Christ and the apostles, in organizing the church at first on revolutionary principles. This is the highest and most authoritative precedent

that can be, and ought not to be thought lightly of, by any professed Christian. It demands the respect of all Christian churches. A church which was founded on revolutionary principles, and which in its origin was the great Protestant and revolutionary movement of the times and country in which it arose, cannot object to revolutionary reörganizations in emergencies which are judged to demand them. Such is the church of Christ. It was a revolutionary reörganization of religion, to free it from the errors of a corrupt Judaism. It was a Protestant organization, all its members uniting in a solemn protest against Jewish corruption generally, and Jewish spiritual despotism in particular.

The right of revolution in the church rests on the same principles as the similar right in the state, and is equally necessary. The right of revolution in the state is the safeguard of civil liberty and prosperity; and that of revolution in the church, of religious liberty and prosperity. Both are equally valid, and indispensably necessary for the promotion of the interests of mankind.

The great objection to the right of revolutionism in the church, and of the multiplication of independent church organizations indefinitely, is, that it divides the church, and allows one church to be arrayed against others. It divides Episcopalians from Methodists, Episcopalians and Methodists from Presbyterians, and all these from Congregationalists, and so on.

Of course it does. And what is the effect of these divisions? The general increase of knowledge, wisdom and piety, and a gradual process towards reünion on higher and nobler principles than those of authority, principles of agreement in holding to truth and expediency.

The idea of supporting truth by authority is preposterous and absurd. It implies a misconception of its nature, and of the correlative laws of the human mind. Authority can give truth no valuable support. Its effect is only to embarrass and hinder its progress. It would not be less preposterous to teach mathe-

matics, chemistry and philosophy, by authority, than religion. Mathematics, chemistry and philosophy, if taught at all, must be taught by their essential evidences; so must religion, both natural and revealed.

The catechetical schools arose in the second century, to meet the exigences of the church in respect to education. The most celebrated of them were the schools of Alexandria, Edessa, at Nisibis, and at Seleucia.

It is supposed by some that schools of this kind were founded by John at Ephesus, and by Polycarp at Smyrna. This is very probable; but we have no explicit information on the subject from any reliable source. The catechetic schools were Christian schools, both of sacred and general learning. That of Alexandria was one of the most distinguished seats of learning known to ancient times.

But the ministry was not supplied principally from the schools of the church. It was supplied principally from the ranks of the laity, and from the other professions and employments of life, particularly the literary professions.

As long as each congregation had a plurality of ministers, these presided at their religious and business meetings in turn, or according to such other arrangements as they deemed suitable to their circumstances, and officiated in public worship without any considerable study in the way of special preparation for their public instructions. Under this arrangement, the pastors required but little support from their churches. But, in process of time, one minister came to officiate principally in all the congregations, and to require from them a full support. Even Paul was to some extent a self-supporting missionary; and many others were self-supporting pastors.

But, as the churches became enlarged and enlightened, the labors of their ministers became increased, and it became necessary for them to devote themselves exclusively to their ministerial work.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE CHURCH.

THE prime minister and head of the Christian church is the Lord Jesus Christ. While he was present in the flesh, with his disciples, he exercised the powers of king or absolute sovereign over them, with various exalted titles, but with little kingly state. The following are the principal of his titles:

1. *Κυριὸς*, Lord. — Luke 1: 43; 7: 13; 10: 1; 11: 39; 17: 5, 6, &c.

2. *Βασιλευς*, King. — Luke 19: 38; John 1: 50; 12: 13.

3. *θεος*, God. — John 1: 1; 20: 28; Rom. 9: 5; 1 Tim. 3: 16.

4. *Ὑιος του θεου*, Son of God. — Matt. 16: 16; Mark 14: 61; Luke 4: 41; John 6: 69.

5. *Χριστος*, Christ, the anointed; corresponding to the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ, Messiah.

6. *Λογος*, Word, or Reason. — John 1: 1, 14; Rev. 19: 13.

7. *Καθηγητης*, Master. — Matt. 23: 8, 10.

8. *Ῥαββι*, Doctor. — Matt. 26: 25, 49; Mark 9: 5; 11: 21; 14: 45.

9. *Ῥαββουνι*, Great Doctor. — Mark 10: 51; John 20: 16.

10. *Επισκοπος*, Bishop. — 1 Pet. 2: 25. The same is applied to God. — Sept.; Job 20: 29.

11. *Ποιμην*, Shepherd, or Pastor. — John 10: 14; Heb. 13: 20; 1 Pet. 2: 25.

12. *Αποστολος*, Apostle. — Heb. 3: 1.

13. *Ασχιερεος*, High Priest. — Heb. 3: 1; 7: 26; 9: 11; 10: 20.

Notwithstanding the assumption of these exalted titles, our Lord associated with his disciples as a friend and com-

panion; and washed their feet, as an example of humility and mutual kindness for their imitation.—John 13: 13—17; Matt. 20: 25—28; Mark 10: 43—45.

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOSTLES.

THE highest order of church officers under Christ was that of the *Αποστολοι*, apostles, of which the original number was twelve. *Αποστολος* is from *Αποστελλω*, to send, and literally means sent, a legate, a missionary.

The apostles are distinguished from other officers in the Christian church by the following characteristics:

I. Their election and ordination was by Christ, as witnesses and primary teachers of Christianity.

II. Their original number was twelve.

III. They were endowed with the power of performing miracles.

IV. The rank assigned them corresponds to that of the prophets under the former dispensation.

V. Their office was temporary, and not designed to be perpetuated in the church.

I. The election and ordination of the apostles. This is particularly described in the Gospels. Luke 6: 12—17.—And it came to pass, in those days, that he went out to a mountain to pray, and spent the night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called his disciples, and, *having chosen out of them twelve*, he called them apostles.

1. Simon, whom he called Peter: and
2. Andrew, his brother;
3. James; and
4. John;
5. Philip; and

6. Bartholomew;
7. Matthew; and
8. Thomas;
9. James, the son of Alpheus; and
10. Simon, called Zelotes;
11. Judas, the brother of James; and
12. Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

Matthew describes this transaction at large, chapter 10; and mentions, among their offices,

1. The power of healing all kinds of diseases. — Verse 2.
2. Their charge to preach.
3. The manner in which they should execute their ministry
4. And the persons to whom they should preach, the Israelites alone.

When Judas had lost his place in the college of the apostles, and it was to be filled, two candidates were chosen in a general meeting of the disciples apostles, and others, to the number of one hundred and twenty; and the election between them submitted to God by lot. — Acts 1: 15—26.

Paul was subsequently added to the apostolic college. 1 Tim. 2: 7. — "For which (testimony) I have been made Κηρυξ, a herald and apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth." The same declaration is repeated 2 Tim. 1: 11. — "For which (testimony) I have been made a herald and apostle, and teacher of the Gentiles." The same also says, 2 Cor. 12: 11, 12. — "In nothing am I behind the eminence of the apostles. For the *signs* of an apostle were performed among you with all patience, in miracles and wonders and mighty deeds."

Peter intimates that personal acquaintance with Christ was necessary to apostleship, in order that they might be witnesses of his resurrection. — Acts 1: 21, 22.

II. The number of the apostles was twelve.

No explanation of this is found in the New Testament. There cannot be a doubt, however, that this number was selected with

reference to the twelve tribes of Israel, perhaps with reference to the twelve patriarchs, or heads of those tribes. They were, in the first place, ministers to the twelve tribes of Israel, and were not ordinarily allowed, till after the resurrection, to preach to any others. The following passages sustain the above supposition. Matt. 19 : 28. — "Jesus said to them, Verily I say to you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration [my renovated kingdom] when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, shall yourselves sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." — Luke 22 : 30.

III. They were endued with the power of performing miracles. This is expressly asserted as one of the principal parts of their office.— Matt. 10 : 1. It was necessary to give the greatest possible credibility to their testimony. It was the divine seal of their apostleship, to prove that they were not deceivers. The same power was given to Moses for the like purpose. — Ex. 7 : 9, 17, &c.

IV. The rank assigned to the apostles corresponds to that of the Old Testament prophets.

Luke 11 : 4. — "Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them *prophets* and *apostles*, and some of them they shall slay and persecute." Eph. 3 : 5. — "Which (mystery) in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it has now been revealed to his *holy apostles* and *prophets* by the Spirit." Rev. 18 : 20. — "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye *holy apostles* and *prophets*, for God hath exacted punishment for you of her."

V. The office of the apostles was temporary.

1. This appears first from its nature. They were witnesses to bear witness concerning Christ. As an office of testimony it could not continue after adequate testimony was once obtained, and the great fundamental facts of Christianity duly attested.

2. Except in the case of Judas, no successors to the apostles are noticed or referred to in the New Testament. It was proper that the place of Judas should be filled by a competent witness,

because the testimony for which the office was appointed was not at that time delivered to the world.

3. The name of apostles was not retained in the church subsequent to their times as a name of office.

The only church officers which survived the apostles are such as bear the designation of bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

Besides its use in the New Testament, as a title of office, the word *Αποστολος*, apostle, is sometimes used in its etymological signification of a missionary, a legate, or its more general signification of a messenger or delegate.

The following are examples of this:

Acts 14: 14. — "But the apostles [missionaries] Barnabas and Paul rent their clothes and rushed into the crowd, crying and saying," &c. Rom. 16: 7. — "Salute Andronicus and Junius, my kinsmen, and fellow-prisoners, who are distinguished among the *apostles* [missionaries]." 2 Cor. 8: 23. — "If any inquire concerning Titus, he is my companion and fellow-laborer for you; or if our brethren be inquired about, they are the apostles [missionaries] of the churches, and the glory of Christ." Phil. 2: 25. — "I deemed it necessary to send Epaphroditus, my brother, fellow-laborer, and fellow-soldier, but your *apostle* [missionary] and the minister of my need." John 13: 16. — "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that the servant is not greater than his lord, nor the apostle [the legate] than he that sent him."

Missionary is a word of Latin derivation, corresponding to apostle, which is Greek. The primary meaning of both these words is the same.

It does not appear that there was any diversity of rank among the apostles, or inequality of powers. Peter is called first, as first chosen to this office; and Judas Iscariot is always mentioned last. Peter was also forward and prompt in conversation, and often spoke for the rest; but no instance appears in which he claimed, or exercised, any authority over the others.

Three of the apostles died by martyrdom, James the elder, Peter and Paul. The tradition that they all suffered martyrdom

is without any historical evidence in its support; and is, undoubtedly, false.

On the departure of Christ at the ascension, the apostles were left in charge of his church and kingdom, to complete its establishment, and promote its diffusion as widely as possible.

It is supposed that they remained generally at Jerusalem, and that they labored principally for the conversion of the Jews for about twelve years, and that they then distributed themselves to several different countries. Peter went to the East, and had his residence at Babylon, where there was a numerous Jewish population, 1 Peter 5 : 13; and we hear nothing from him after his second epistle, A. D. 66. John died at Ephesus, after having long resided and labored there. Andrew is supposed to have gone to Asia Minor, near Constantinople; Philip, to have died at Hierapolis, in Phrygia; Thomas, to have travelled into Parthia, Media, Persia and India; Matthew, to Persia, and Bartholomew, to Arabia. Of Simon Zelotes nothing is known. Jude is supposed to have preached in the north of Syria. James the elder suffered martyrdom at Jerusalem, A. D. 44, and was succeeded by James the brother of our Lord, who continued, for many years, to have charge of the church there. The last that we hear of him is at that place. Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome, A. D. 66.

The pretended supremacy of Peter, claimed by the Papal church to justify its own assumptions, receives no support from the New Testament, nor from the early fathers, and is, undoubtedly, an invention of later and corrupt times.

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF PETER.

After the ascension of our Lord, A. D. 33, Peter, with the rest of the apostles, continued for some years at Jerusalem. In A. D. 41, he went from Joppa, a border town of the tribe of Dan, on the coast of the Mediterranean, forty-five miles north-west of Jerusalem, to Cesarea, thirty miles further north, to preach the Gospel to Cornelius and his friends.

Cesarea was sixty-two miles north-west of Jerusalem. It was the residence of the Roman governors, and, for a time, one of the most flourishing and populous cities of Syria.

From Cesarea Peter returned to Jerusalem. Here he was imprisoned by Herod Agrippa, and delivered by an angel, in A. D. 44. We previously hear of him at Lydda, a town on the way from Jerusalem to Cesarea, about nine miles from Joppa.

Paul speaks of having found Peter at Jerusalem, Gal. 1 : 18. — "Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days." 2 : 9. — "And when James, Peter and John, who were evidently pillars (of the church), perceived the grace that was given to me, they gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision." This is supposed to have been in A. D. 38. Saul's conversion having been in 35, three years brings us to 38. Add to this fourteen years, Gal. 2 : 1, and it will bring us to A. D. 52.

This 52 is the time of the celebrated council at Jerusalem, on the subject of circumcision and the Jewish rites, described in Acts 15 : 1—35.

After this Peter is mentioned as being at Antioch, when Paul reproved him for dissimulation in respect to the Jewish usages.

— Gal. 2 : 11. This must have been subsequent to the visit of the commissioners from the council at Jerusalem in A. D. 52 or 53, — Acts 15 : 27, 35, — and antecedent to Paul's second missionary tour.

The book of Acts takes leave of Peter, Acts 15 : 6—11. Paul finds James there on his last visit to that city, in A. D. 60, but Peter is not named. Acts 21 : 18. — "The following day Paul went in with us to James, and all the presbyters were present."

Two years earlier, A. D. 58, Paul writes his epistle from Corinth to the Romans, in which he sends salutations to twenty-six individuals, and two families; but sends none to Peter. — See chap. 15, compared with 1 Cor. 1 : 14; 2 Tim. 4 : 20.

The whole tenor and spirit of this epistle show, clearly, that Peter could not have been bishop of Rome at this time, and that he could not have been the founder of the church at that place.

Still later, in A. D. 62, when Paul comes to Rome as a prisoner, the brethren from that city went out to meet him as far as the forum of Appius, but no mention is made of Peter. — Acts 28 : 15.

Three days after this, in a meeting which Paul had called together, his Jewish brethren desire to hear him, to obtain authentic information concerning the sect to which he belonged. — Acts 28 : 22. They could not have required information concerning this sect, if Peter had resided there and been the head of the Christian world, or even bishop of the church of Rome. So that, up to 62 A. D., Peter could not have been at Rome.

We hear from this apostle twice after this by his own epistles; in his first epistle, dated at Babylon, 1 Pet. 5 : 13, "The church at Babylon, coëlect with you, saluteth you, also Mark my son." This epistle is addressed to the *dispersed* Christian Jews, of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia (Ionia) and Bithynia.

At this time the province and city of Babylon belonged to the powerful kingdom of the Parthians, which comprised the Persian empire. This kingdom was separated from the Roman empire by the river Euphrates.

The city of Babylon contained a large Gentile population, and a large number of Jews. — Josephus' Antiquities, xv. c. 2, sec. 2, xv. 3, 1, xviii. 9, 1, Philo Op. 11, pp. 578, 587.

It was, therefore, a suitable place of residence for the great apostle of the circumcision, near the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. — Gal. 2 : 8.

The churches in Asia Minor having been under the more particular supervision of Paul, the first epistle of Peter could not have been written till after Paul's death.

There is a distinct evidence that its composition was after that event, in the references to severe persecutions; the first severe and general persecution being that under Nero, A. D. 64—68, in which Paul was executed. — 1 Pet. 1 : 6, 7; 3 : 13—16; 4 : 12—19; 5 : 10.

Paul's martyrdom having been in A. D. 66, we infer that first Peter may have been written the same year, or the year following, 67.

The second epistle of Peter seems to have been written soon after the first, perhaps the next year, A. D. 68. It is directed to Christians generally, and seems to be a kind of farewell letter to the church of God, in anticipation of his approaching departure. — 2 Pet. 1 : 12—15; 3 : 1. In this he alludes to Paul as already dead. 2 Pet. 3 : 15, 16. — "Even as our beloved brother Paul used to write in all his epistles, speaking of these things."

Peter was not a young man at his call to the apostleship. He was probably entitled in part by age to his preëminence among the twelve apostles during our Lord's public ministry. His wife's mother was among the subjects of Christ's miraculous cures. — Matt. 8 : 14, 15.

Supposing Peter to have been only thirty-one at his call to the apostleship, A. D. 31, at the date of his second epistle, A. D. 68, he would have been sixty-eight; but he was probably older. Such is the New Testament history of the apostleship and life of Peter.

The field of his labors comprehended Jerusalem, Syria, perhaps

Asia Minor, Babylon and the East; and the more immediate objects of his attention were the Jews, of whom great numbers resided at Babylon.

Tradition teaches that Peter visited Rome twice; the first time in the second year of Claudius, A. D. 42, after having previously founded the *Episcopate* of Antioch. This tradition dates from Eusebius, A. D. 340. It is confirmed and established by Jerome, A. D. 420, who adds that it was Peter's object, in visiting Rome, to combat Simon the magician, and that he was bishop of Rome twenty-five years, till the last year of Nero, A. D. 68, from A. D. 43 to 68. Leo, 461, fixed the duration of Peter's episcopacy at Antioch at seven years, from A. D. 36—43.

Lactantius, A. D. 325, tells us that Peter did not arrive at Rome till under the reign of Nero; and Origen, A. D. 253, that he only came there to die.

The error of Eusebius is traced through Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 220, to a misunderstanding of Justin Martyr, A. D. 168, interpreting the inscription of a statue of the Roman deity Semo, of *Simon* the magician. See Acts 8: 4, 10, 11, 18—24. This mistake led to a fabulous history of the supposed combat of Peter with Simon, and the supposition of his residence at Rome.

The church of Antioch was founded by Paul and Barnabas,—Acts 11: 19—26,—A. D. 39. Mark's supposed residence at Rome depends upon the supposition that Peter resided there, and has no other foundation. Mark was Peter's companion at Babylon. —1 Pet. 5: 13.

The most probable supposition in respect to the composition of Mark's Gospel is, that it was written at Babylon after the death of the apostle Paul, and designed for general circulation in the Roman empire.

The earliest tradition of Peter's martyrdom is that of Clement, third bishop of Rome, who, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, exhorts them to look for courage and perseverance to the exam-

ples of the apostles; and then describes Peter and Paul as having suffered martyrdom for the sake of the Gospel, but does not say where they suffered. Neither does he ever speak of Peter as having been at Rome.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, A. D. 176, in a letter preserved by Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. II. 25, tells us that Peter and Paul together instructed the Corinthians, and, having at the same time left Corinth for Italy, they together instructed the Romans, and suffered martyrdom in the same manner. The genuineness of this is much doubted. It is certainly false.

The tradition that Paul travelled extensively after his first imprisonment, Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. II. 22, seems to rest on no more valid foundation than 2 Tim. 4 : 17, and Rom. 15 : 24.

Paul arrived at Rome in the spring, A. D. 62. The burning of Rome by Nero commenced July 19, A. D. 64. Immediately after this, the persecution broke out. So illustrious a leader as Paul would not be expected to escape.

A statement of the Roman presbyter Gaius, A. D. 215, has been interpreted as giving support to the testimony of Dionysius in favor of the martyrdom of Peter at Rome. His language is, "But I can show the trophies of the apostles. Whether you turn to the Vatican or to the Via Ostia, you meet with the trophies of those who are the founders of the church." Jerome interprets this as referring to the graves of the apostles Peter and Paul. Eusebius does the same. But this is putting on the language of Gaius more than it expresses.

But Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, A. D. 218, affirms the martyrdom of Peter at Rome; and after him it is positively affirmed by Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius, Jerome and others. Tertullian says that he died by the same death as the Saviour. Origen was the first to say that he was crucified with his head downwards; and Rufinus adds a reason, that he might not suffer the same death as his Saviour.

The tradition of Peter's death at Rome is a natural accompa-

niment of the fiction that he lived and labored there; and has no solid foundation. The manifest error of supposing that he had lived there, sufficiently accounts for the tradition that he died there. There is no evidence in favor of either; but the contrary.

Finding Peter at Babylon, A. D. 67, and probably in 68, where he wrote his second epistle, at an age when men are not apt to travel, and beyond the limits of the Roman empire, but within the dominions of another persecuting power, the only rational supposition is, that he suffered martyrdom in the East, and probably at Babylon.

All the support derived by the Papacy from the supposed episcopacy of Peter at Rome amounts to *nothing*. It is quite certain that he never was bishop of Rome, and extremely probable that he never visited that city, and that he did not receive his crown of martyrdom there.

The origin and prevalence of the tradition respecting Peter's supposed episcopacy at Rome, are among the curiosities of history, and well worthy of the attention of the critical scholar.

The source of all these traditions seems to have been, the symbolical interpretation of Babylon, 1 Pet. 5: 13. This was taken from Rev. 18: 2; and even now has supporters, but is contrary to all just principles of interpretation.

Besides the fact of their late origin, near the end of the second century, the manifestly incorrect and contradictory character of these traditions betrays their falsehood.

A Christian in the latter part of the second century undertook to resolve the principal exciting questions of his time, by a work of fiction, under the title of τακλημεντια, Memoirs of Clement; consisting of three prologues and twenty homilies, pretending to reveal the apostolic traditions. To obviate any objections which it might encounter from its late appearance, it was prefaced by a letter from the apostle Peter to James, in which the latter is requested to communicate his homilies only to trustworthy brethren, under the seal of secrecy upon oath. — Hom. II. 17.

This book makes Clement, in his travels in pursuit of knowledge, meet Peter in the East, from whom he receives the Gospel. In a letter of Peter to James, he gives the latter the title of lord and bishop of bishops, and makes him the superior of the two. It also represents, contrary to fact, Peter as the true apostle to the Gentiles, and the founder and first bishop of the church at Rome. The work immediately gained credit at Rome, and was modified and circulated under the title of the Recognitions of Clement, about A. D. 230.

These were followed by another pious forgery of the constitutions of the apostles, written near the close of the third century. Till the latter part of the third century, the Roman episcopacy of Peter is asserted by the Recognitions of Clement alone; a work of about equal authority and honesty with the book of Mormon. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 184.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, is the first father who designates the Roman episcopate the "*Locum Petri*," and *Petri Cathedram*. The first bishop who claimed this succession was Stephen, A. D. 253—256.

The bishops at this time acquired great importance by administering, with the assistance of the deacons, the large estates of the churches, and acting as arbiters and judges in all cases of difficulties and litigations among church-members.

The first instance of the interference of the bishop of Rome in the affairs of remote churches was in A. D. 254, when Stephen reïnstated Basilides and Martiales, two deposed bishops in Spain, in their offices. This was highly disapproved by Cyprian, who vindicated the independence of remote churches of the Roman See, Ep. 68. The Papacy was not exalted to an infallible vicarage of Christ till the time of Gregory VII., in the eleventh century.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ELDERSHIP OF THE APOSTLES.

The apostles never call themselves bishops, but, when they assume any more general title of office, they call themselves presbyters and deacons. No bishops appear in heaven. The four primates seen by John, corresponding to the seraphim of Isaiah, the living chariot of Ezekiel, and the cherubim of the earlier prophets, seem to be the four prime ministers of the eternal throne, standing next to God, and presiding, under him, over the four general departments of his universal kingdom, the eastern, western, northern and southern.

The twenty-four presbyters seem to be the celestial pastors, under God, of his church of the reclaimed of all ages from this world; twelve answering to the twelve patriarchs, or heads of tribes under the Mosaic dispensation, and twelve answering to the twelve apostles, the primary presbyters of Christianity, and, under Christ, the great patriarchs of the Christian dispensation. The scene, however, is pictorial, and emblematic; and may be understood as representing the celestial kingdom of God, and the celestial glory of the church, under such imagery as is best adapted to give us some adequate and profitable conception of these objects, without representing literally the objects themselves.

The twelve apostles were chosen and set apart to their office, in the early part of our Lord's public ministry. — Matt. 10 : 2, &c. Subsequently, our Lord appointed seventy elders, and commissioned them to go before him, two and two, to every city and place whither himself would come. These seventy were apostles equally with the first twelve, and received a similar charge with

reference to preaching the Gospel, and a similar endowment with the power of performing miracles. — Luke 10 : 3—20 compared with Matt. 10 : 1—42. But they did not enjoy the honor of the first twelve, to serve as constant attendants on our Lord's person; nor did they receive the same high commission with respect to testifying of his works, and completing the establishment of his kingdom, after the crucifixion.

As the twelve had been previously appointed with reference to the twelve tribes of Israel, to intimate the universality of the kingdom in which they held their office, so the seventy are generally supposed to have been added to correspond with the seventy elders appointed by Moses, to assist him, by divine direction, in the government and care of the Hebrew commonwealth. — Num. 11 : 16, 17, 24—30. The seventy to whom these seventy correspond in the Jewish commonwealth are denominated elders or presbyters.

After this institution of the apostleship, we have no account of the institution of any other order of Christian ministers, except that of deacons. Besides corresponding to the Jewish presbyters as the twelve heads of tribes and divisions in the kingdom of God, and the seventy presbyters, to assist their Lord and supreme sovereign in administering the offices of his kingdom, the apostles in three instances assume the title of presbyter apparently as a title of office, in 1 Pet. 5 : 1 ; 2 John 1, and 3 John 1 : 1. Besides, the duties of the apostleship comprehend all those which we subsequently find devolved upon the presbytership.

I conclude, therefore, that the apostles were the primitive church presbyters and bishops; and that the presbytership which we find generally established in the church, without any account of its institution under that title, had its origin in the institution of the apostleship, to which it bears general resemblance.

CHAPTER X.

BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS.

The English word bishop is derived from the Saxon biscop. Presbyter is derived from the Greek πρεσβυτερος, or is rather the same word, transferred, almost without change, from the Greek to the English language.

Bishop is used in the New Testament, in the common English version of the Bible, as the translation of επισκοπος. *Επισκοπος*, signifies:

1. A protector, a guardian. — Iliad, 24, 729, 22, 255.
2. An inspector.— Odyssey, 8, 163.
3. Corresponding to the Hebrew פָּקִיד, an overseer and director of workmen.
4. A Grecian magistrate or prefect of a city.
5. A Christian minister, a presbyter and pastor of a Christian church.

Πρεσβοτερος, generally translated in the New Testament *elder*, signifies:

1. An aged person. — 1 Tim. 5: 1, 2; Acts 2: 17; 1 Pet. 5: 5.
2. A Jewish magistrate, corresponding to the Hebrew זָקֵן.
3. A Christian minister and pastor of a Christian church; a bishop.

When applied to denote the Christian ministry, in the common version of the New Testament, it is uniformly translated elder. In the present argument, and throughout this work, I have thought it best to retain the original word, or the slightly altered form of it, of *presbyter*.

The Christian episcopacy or presbytership is an office of

authority. The precise nature and extent of this authority is determined with difficulty, and is a matter of debate among Christians. It is important, however, that it should be accurately and clearly settled, and as far as possible placed beyond reasonable dispute.

The church *Επισκοποι*, bishops, are in the New Testament called *Πρεσβυτεροι*, presbyters; and their titles are used interchangeably, to denote the same officers.

Πρεσβυτερος, presbyter, corresponds to the Hebrew זָקֵן elder, which was the general title of the magistracy among the Israelites, from the time of Moses to that of Christ.

It was the general title of the Jewish magistracy in the time of Christ, and is frequently used as such in the New Testament. Matt. 16: 21. — "From that time Jesus began to show to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the *elders*, and the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed and raised again the third day." 26: 3, 4. — "Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders, of the people, to the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and consulted how they might take Jesus by deception and kill him."

Acts 4: 5—7. — "And it came pass on the morrow, that the rulers, and elders, and scribes, were gathered together at Jerusalem, and Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and all the kindred of the high priest, and, placing them in the midst, they asked them, By what power or by what name have ye done this?"

Luke 22: 66, 67. — "And when it was day the eldership of the people, the chief priests and the scribes, led him to their *συνεδριον*, synedrium, saying, Art thou the Christ?" Acts 4: 15. — "Commanding them to go out of the synedrium, they consulted together, saying," &c. 5: 41; 6: 12. — "And they moved the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and falling upon him they seized him and led him to the synedrium."

In all these passages the elders or presbyters referred to are

Jewish magistrates, and have no connection with the Christian church.

The same title, however, was applied to denote the magistracy in the Christian church, under the general signification of church magistrate, or church officer. The same officers are called both bishops and presbyters. Presbyters appears to have been the Jewish appellation, an appellation derived from Jewish usage, and bishops from the usage of the Greeks, with whom the Jews were now brought into intimate association, and with whom they had constant intercourse.

Acts 20 : 17. — "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the presbyters of the church." When they were come, he delivers them the memorable farewell address that follows, containing, among other things, the following charge: Verse 28. — "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock εν ὡ, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you επισκοπους, bishops, to ποιμαινειν, take the pastoral care of the church of God;" that is, to take such care of the church as a shepherd takes of his flock, to guide, feed and protect it.

These persons were sent for as presbyters of the church at Ephesus. — v. 17. They are here described as bishops, and as made bishops by the Holy Spirit; proving conclusively that at this time bishops and presbyters were the same, and proving also a plurality of bishops in the same church; both of which are inconsistent with the doctrine of prelatical episcopacy.

Phil. 1 : 1, 2. — "Paul and Timothy, δουλοι, servants of Christ to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the επισκοποις bishops and deacons, grace to you and peace from God our father and the Lord Jesus Christ." Here all the church officers are comprehended under the titles of bishops and deacons; and here, too, as in the other case, we have a plurality of bishops in the same church. Of course they could not have been prelatical bishops. They must have been co-pastors of the church at Philippi. Neither can it be assumed, on any ground of evidence, that there was an intermediate order of

parochial clergy, between the bishops and deacons, not mentioned in the direction of this letter. Had there been such an order, they would have been entitled to be mentioned, and would doubtless have had their due.

1 Tim. 3: 1—13. — "This is a faithful saying; if a man desires the office of bishop, he desires a good work." A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, polite, hospitable, instructive, not addicted to the use of wine, not a striker, not a seeker of base gain, but patient, inoffensive, and without avarice, ruling his own family well, and having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for, if a man knows not how to rule his own family, how shall he take care of the church of God?) not a novice, lest, being elated, he fall into the condemnation of the devil.

"But it is necessary that he should have a good repute from those without, that he may not fall into reproach and a snare of the devil.

"Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of base gain, holding the mystery of faith in a pure conscience. And let them first be proved, and then let them serve as deacons, being found blameless. The women (female deacons) also must be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. The deacons must be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own families well."

The only church officers here mentioned are bishops and deacons; and the bishop's care of the church is compared to a householder's care of his family. — v. 5.

Titus 1: 5—9. — "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest regulate things that are deficient, and appoint presbyters in every city, as I had commanded thee. If a man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of dissipation, nor insubordinate. For τον επισκοπον the bishop, must be blameless as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, not a striker, not

greedy of base gain, but hospitable, a lover of the good, just, holy, continent, holding fast the faithful word in his teaching, that he may be able by sound instruction both to admonish and convince the gainsayers."

This passage describes the office of bishops and presbyters as the same. It requires presbyters to be appointed in every city; and then requires them to be blameless and of good character, because a bishop *must* be so. The epistle to Titus is dated A. D. 65. So that, up to this period, more than thirty years from the pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the full establishment of Christianity, the office of bishop and presbyter was perfectly identical, and these names were applied interchangeably to denote a single order of church officers, that below the apostles, and above the deacons.

The other passages in which Christian presbyters are mentioned are the following:

Acts 11: 29, 30.—"Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren who lived in Judea; which also they did, and sent it to the presbyters by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."

14: 23.— *Χειροτονησαντες.* "Having appointed for them presbyters in every church, and having prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, in whom they had believed."

These words describe the procedure of Paul and Barnabas in the organization of churches, during their missionary labors in Asia Minor, A. D. 46. They appointed over their churches a ministry selected from among themselves, selected by the vote of the membership; so *Χειροτονησαντες* signifies. Had they done it by their own authority, another word would have been used. This ministry is a ministry of presbyters.

When the controversy arose respecting circumcision, it was agreed, at Antioch, that Paul and Barnabas should go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and presbyters about this question.—Acts 15: 2. When they had come to Jerusalem they reported

themselves to the *church*, the *apostles* and presbyters. — v. 4. The question being proposed, the apostles and presbyters came together to consider it. After there had been much debate by others, Peter, Barnabas, Paul and James, argued against the imposition of circumcision and other Jewish rites on the Gentiles. — v. 22. Then it pleased the apostles and presbyters, with the whole church, to concur in those opinions, and they express the same in a letter, as follows: "The apostles and presbyters and brethren send greeting to the brethren of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia," &c. Delegates also accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Antioch with this letter, and were let go in peace by the brethren. — v. 33.

Here, A. D. 52, are no bishops, but apostles, presbyters and brethren.

Acts 16 : 4. — On another missionary tour, as Paul and Silas went through the cities, they charged the people to observe the rules which had been decided upon by the apostles and presbyters, at Jerusalem.

20 : 17, 18. — On a subsequent visit to Jerusalem, it is said, "And when we were come to Jerusalem, the *brethren* received us gladly. And on the following day Paul went with us to James, and all the presbyters were present." This seems to have been a meeting of ministers.

1 Tim. 5 : 17. — "Let the presbyters that preside well be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching." This does not imply that all presbyters were not authorized to preach, but simply that some did not perform statedly this part of the presbyter's duty. It is the furthest possible from teaching the distinction which is sometimes put upon it, of preaching and ruling presbyters. The passage is perfectly consistent on the supposition that all presbyters had the same office, and that some exercised it more fully than others. It cannot, therefore, be relied upon, in the absence of any collateral evidence for that supposition, to prove that they had different offices.

Verse 19. — "Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, except with two or three witnesses."

James 5 : 14. — "If any among you is sick, let him send for the presbyters of the church, and let them pray for him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." Anointing with oil was a common luxury, practised daily, like washing and dressing, and the use of perfumery. The persons to pray for the sick are the parish ministers.

1 Pet. 5 : 1. — "The presbyters who are among you I exhort, who am myself a co-presbyter, and witness of the sufferings of Christ, and partaker of the glory to be revealed."

2 John, verse 1. — "The presbyter to the elect lady and her children."

3 John, verse 1. — "The presbyter to the beloved Gaius."

Πρεσβυτεριον denoted an assembly of elders among the Jews. — Luke 12 : 66; Acts 22 : 5. The same word is used to denote a meeting of Christian ministers.

1 Tim. 4 : 14. — "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, that was given thee by prophecy, by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery, the college or association of ministers" in ordination.

The original identity of the office of bishop and presbyter is distinctly set forth in the writings of Jerome of Stridon, a monk of Palestine. Jerome was born of Christian parents, about the year A. D. 331. His father, Eusebius, gave him the best advantages for education that were to be attained at that period. He was early sent to Rome, where he studied many years under the best masters. He was baptized about the year 363, at thirty-two years of age, and travelled extensively for his improvement. He became a monk at Trevs in Gaul, where he resided some years. He then went to Aquileia.

In 373, at forty years of age, he went to Syria. In 374 he retired to a wilderness east of Antioch, and there spent about fourteen years. In 378 or 379 he returned to Antioch, and was ordained a presbyter at the age of forty-seven. The next

year he visited Constantinople, to enjoy the instructions of Gregory Nazianzen. In 382 he went to Rome, and became an intimate friend of Damasus, bishop of Rome. He here undertook, at the suggestion of Damasus, a revision of the Latin Bible.

Giving offence by his great zeal for monasticism and other peculiarities, he left Rome in 385, with Paula, and Eustōchiuem her daughter, two wealthy Roman ladies, whom he inspired with a portion of his zeal for monasticism. He first went to Antioch, then to Jerusalem, where he spent the winter with his nuns. In the spring of 386, they went to Alexandria, and, returning the same year, they took up their residence at Bethlehem. Here Paula erected four monasteries, — three for nuns, and one for monks. In the last, Jerome spent the latter part of his life, and died A. D. 420, aged ninety. He was the best informed of all the Latin fathers in sacred literature, and was eminent for classical and general learning. His writings are numerous and valuable, embracing an improved translation of the Bible into Latin. His translation of the Bible, with slight alterations, is the standard of the Roman Catholic church at the present time. He was one of the ablest interpreters in the ancient church. This might be inferred from the fact that he was so successful as a translator.

Jerome concurs perfectly with the above, and rests his views both on the Scriptures and on tradition.

In epistle 82 to Oceanus, he says, "With the ancients, bishops and presbyters were the same; the former was a name of dignity, the latter of age." Again, he says: "The presbyter is the same as the bishop; and before, by the influence of the devil, parties were formed in religion, and it was said among the people, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the churches were governed by a common council of presbyters. If any one thinks that it is our opinion, and not the doctrine of the Scriptures, that the bishop and presbyter was the same, the one title a name of age, and the other, a name of office, let

him read the apostle's words to the Philippians. — 1 : 1; Acts 20 : 17, 28," &c.

The same doctrine is taught by Augustine, bishop of Hippo, in Africa, from 395 to 430, and the most eminent of all the Latin fathers, in his 82d epistle.

By Chrysostom, Hom. I. on Phil. 1 : 1. Theodoret on the same. Gregory VII., A. D. 1088, c. 12, copies the passage from Jerome's epistle to Oceanus, and adds: "Since, then, presbyters and bishops are related to have been anciently the same, they doubtless had the same power of binding and absolving, and other powers now peculiar to the bishops."

Pope Urban II., A. D. 1091. — "We say that the orders of deacons and presbyters are sacred, since the primitive church is related to have had them alone." Gratian says: "Formerly, presbyters ruled the church in common, and ordained priests." This doctrine continued in the papal church till 1570, when it appears in the writings of a celebrated papal canonist, J. Paul Lancelot. After the Protestant reformation, it was found convenient to ignore this fact so long admitted; and the late English and American Episcopalians have fallen into the same error.

The fact, however, is certain. The primitive episcopacy, whatever it was, and the primitive presbytership, were the same, being only different names for the same office. The separation of these offices is by the exaltation of one original minister higher than Christ placed him, under the title of bishop; and depressing another lower than Christ placed him, under the title of a presbyter, thus dividing one order of ministers into two. — Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History. Murdock's Mosheim.

CHAPTER XI.

THE HEAVENLY PRESBYTERS.

The heavenly presbyters seem to be deserving of notice in this connection.

Rev. 4 : 1—4. — "After these things I saw, and behold a door was opened in heaven, and the first voice which I heard was as the voice of a trumpet speaking with me and saying, Come up hither and I will show thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit, and behold a throne was set in heaven, and one sat upon the throne. And he that sat upon it was in appearance like a jasper and sardine-stone, and there was a rainbow about the throne, similar in appearance to an emerald. And around the throne were twenty-four thrones; and upon the thrones sat twenty-four presbyters, clothed in white raiment, and having crowns of gold upon their heads." Verses 10, 11. — When the four cherubim give glory to God, "the twenty-four presbyters fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before his throne, saying" (in response to the cherubim), "Worthy art thou, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy will they are and have been created."

5 : 5, 6. — And one of the presbyters says to me, "Weep not; behold, the lion of the tribe of Judah hath conquered, the root of David hath opened the book and its seven seals. And I saw in the midst of the throne, and of the four cherubim, and in the midst of the presbyters, a Lamb standing as if it had been slain; having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, that are sent into all the earth." Verses 8 and 14. — "And when he took the book, the four cherubim and the

twenty-four presbyters fell down before the Lamb, each having harps and golden vials, full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to receive the book, and to open its seals; because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and hast made us kings and priests to God, and we shall reign on the earth. And I looked, and heard the voice of many angels about the throne, and about the cherubim, and the presbyters. And the number of them was ten thousands of ten thousands and thousands of thousands, saying, with a loud voice, The Lamb that was slain is worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and which is on the sea, all (creation) heard I saying, To him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, be blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, for ever and ever; and the four cherubim said Amen; and the presbyters fell down and worshipped."

7 : 11—17. — "And the angels stood around the throne, and around the presbyters, and the four cherubim, and fell down before the throne upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen! Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and strength, be to our God for ever and ever. Amen.

"And one of the presbyters spoke to me, saying, These that are clothed with white robes, who are they, and whence do they come? And I said to him, My Lord, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they that came out of great tribulation, and washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple, and he that sitteth upon the throne, shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, nor shall the sun fall (oppressively) upon them, nor any (oppressive) heat. But the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their pastor, and shall lead

them to the fountains of the water of life, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

11 : 15—18. — "And the seventh angel sounded, and there were loud voices in heaven, saying, The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the twenty-four presbyters who sat before God on their thrones fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We thank thee, Lord God Almighty, who is, and was, and hast taken thy great power and reigned! And the nations were angry, and thy wrath has come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and to give reward to thy servants the prophets, and the saints, and those that fear thy name, both small and great, and to destroy those that have destroyed the earth."

14 : 1—4. — "And I saw, and behold the Lamb standing upon Mount Zion, and with him one hundred and forty-four thousand, having his name and the name of his Father written upon their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and the voice of great thunder. And the voice which I heard was like the voice of harpers playing upon their harps, and they sang a new song before the throne, and before the four cherubim, and the presbyters; and no one was able to learn that song but the one hundred and forty-four thousand who were redeemed from the earth."

19 : 4. — "And the twenty-four presbyters and the four cherubim fell down and worshipped God, who sat upon the throne, saying, Amen! Alleluia!"

The last of these scenes is that which follows the destruction of Babylon, the great type of the papal apostasy.

What we are to understand by this celestial presbytery, consisting of the four cherubim and twenty-four presbyters, with God for its president, it is impossible to say with precision. It is a representation, undoubtedly, of the court of heaven, to which the divine administration on earth is made remotely to conform. We cannot suppose that heaven is arranged after

models obtained from this world, though we can easily suppose that this world is made to conform in some degree to celestial models.

The sacred tabernacle of Moses was made after the *pattern* exhibited in the mount. — Ex. 25 : 40; Heb. 8 : 5. The Jewish priests served as an example and shadow of heavenly things. — Heb. 8 : 5. The tabernacle itself, with its appurtenances, were all after the pattern, not of a model shown in the mount only, but of the heavenly world. Heb. 9 : 23. Hence Paul says, "It was necessary that the imitations of things in the heavens should be purified with (the Jewish expiatory rites), but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."

Connect with the above, and with the heavenly presbytery of Revelation, Matt. 19 : 28, — "Verily I say to you, that ye who have followed me in the regeneration (revolution), when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, shall yourselves sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

CHAPTER XII.

ARGUMENTS FOR PRELACY.

As the New Testament bishops and presbyters are the same, these titles being different appellations of the same office, and denoting a single order of the ministry, we find no prelatical episcopacy in the New Testament. We do not find bishops as prelates over presbyters, but as themselves presbyters with presbyters.

It is claimed, however, by the advocates of prelatical episcopacy, that, though we do not find this order in the New Testament under the title of bishops, we find it first under the title of the apostles, and then without any distinctive title, in the

persons of Timothy, Titus, and the angels of the seven churches of Ionia addressed by John in Revelation.

It is claimed that Timothy and Titus had the peculiar office of prelatical bishops in three particulars:

1. Ordination;
2. Superintendence of ministers;
3. Regulating matters in the churches.

1. The ordaining power.

"For this cause," says Paul, "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain presbyters in every city, as I appointed thee."—Titus 1: 5. So, likewise, directions were given to Timothy respecting the qualifications of those whom he should ordain to the office of presbyters and deacons. — 1 Tim. 3: 1—13.

These testimonies prove that ordaining powers were vested in Titus and Timothy, and that they were duly authorized judges of the qualifications of candidates. But this does not prove that they were diocesan bishops. The same powers belong to all Congregational ministers.

It does not appear that Timothy and Titus had power to establish presbyters over the churches, without the election of the laity. Such a supposition is contrary to the analogy of the ordination of the first deacons who were elected by the membership and ordained by the apostles. If the membership were allowed to elect assistant ministers, much more should they elect their principals.

2. Superintendence of ministers.

"I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine." — 1 Tim. 1: 3. "Against a presbyter receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses."

Congregational ministers have a mutual watch and care over each other. It is their duty to charge incompetent and erring ministerial brethren in regard to their duty, and, if necessary, to discipline them in their councils and consociations. Different ministers may be more or less prominent in these proceedings,

according to their position and circumstances, and the exigences of the case; but any minister has power, with the assistance of his brethren, to discipline an erring brother. All the members of an association or consociation of Congregational ministers have an episcopal superintendency over each other, equal to that which appears to have been possessed by Timothy and Titus. They may establish presbyters in every city, charge those that teach improperly to teach the truth, and not receive accusations except on the ground of ample evidence.

3. They may set in order things which are defective or imperfect; and in a district where the Gospel may have been recently introduced, and the organization of many churches may be imperfect, an evangelist may travel extensively for the purpose of putting things in order.

It appears from Acts 14: 23, and Titus 1: 5, that the apostles ordained a plurality of presbyters in every church; and when Paul sent for the presbyters of the church of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus (Acts 20: 17), there was a plurality of these officers in that church, and they were all bishops. — Acts 10: 28. This was about A. D. 60.

But at a somewhat later period, when John wrote his epistles to the seven churches of Ionia, he mentions only the angel of each of these churches, and of Ephesus among the rest. — Rev. 2: 1.

Who are to be understood by these angels, commentators are not agreed. Some suppose them to be tutelar angels; the advocates for prelacy suppose them to be prelatical bishops; the advocates for the equality of the ministry and the independence of the churches suppose them to be the presiding ministers in their respective cities and congregations. Angel is a most inappropriate title of a prelatical bishop; and, in the absence of any proof that it is so used, must be interpreted in conformity with its more usual significations.

CHAPTER XIII.

DEACONS.

Διακονος (deacon) denotes, primarily, a servant, as in Matt. 20 : 26. — "It shall not be so among you; but whoever will be great among you, let him be your διακονος (servant)." John 2 : 5. — "His mother says to the διακονοις (servants) that waited on the guests, Whatever he directs you, do."

Among the Greeks, the διακονοι (deacons) were a higher class of servants, a class above the δουλοι (slaves). In Matt. 22 : 13, the king's servants or ministers are called διακονοι (deacons). In John 12 : 26, Christ says, "If any man will serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall my διακονος (servant) be."

The apostles are repeatedly called by this title. — 1 Cor. 3 . 5; 2 Cor. 3 : 6; 6 : 4; 11 : 23; Col. 1 : 25. The same title is applied to other Christian ministers. — 1 Thess. 3 : 2.

As a title of office, deacon denotes in the New Testament an assistant minister, a church officer not charged chiefly with the function of preaching, but with the supervision and distribution of the church charities. The office was instituted to meet a special emergency, arising soon after the large accessions to the church at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. The account of its institution is in the following words : Acts 6 : 1—6. — "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a complaint of the Hellenists against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration [of the church charities].

"Then the twelve called together the multitude of the disciples, and said, It is not fit that we should leave the ministry of the

word of God, to serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out seven men from among you, of good repute, full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom, and we will place them over this business. But we will give ourselves, without remission, to prayer and the ministry of the word.

"And the proposition pleased the whole multitude: and they elected Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicalaus, a proselyte of Antioch, whom they set before the apostles. And they, having prayed, laid their hands on them."

Here we have the following important items of information:

1. The design of the deaconship, to serve tables and superintend the collection and distribution of church charities, that the apostles might not be called off from their higher duties of preaching and public prayer. — v. 2.

2. They were appointed *deacons*, servants and assistants, of the higher ministry, to have charge of the church charities. Other temporalities would, of course, naturally fall into their hands; such as providing for the Lord's table, together with more or less public instruction and exhortation.

3. The appointment was made, and this order of church officers instituted, by the authority of the *brethren*. — v. 5. The proposition was made to the *multitude;* it pleased them, and, was therefore adopted.

4. The apostles acting as the ministry of the church, their co-pastors, ordained these deacons with prayer and the imposition of hands.

The imposition of hands, in the inauguration of public officers, is extremely ancient. It was practised by Moses upon Joshua, at his induction into the office of chief magistrate of the Israelites, as his own successor. — Num. 27 : 18—23. In the same case we have the formality of the official charge.

Paul and Barnabas, after they had entered the ministry and been employed for a time in it, were set apart to the

work of foreign missions, by prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands. — Acts 13 : 1—3.

This ceremony was analogous to the installation of an ordained minister in his charge.

Paul exhorts, 1 Tim. 4 : 14.— "Neglect not the gift that was given thee by prophecy, by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery (the meeting of presbyters)." With respect to ordinations he says, 1 Tim. 5 : 2, "Lay hands suddenly on no man;" and in 2 Tim. 1 : 6, he says, "I put thee in remembrance to stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands."

Miraculous powers were communicated by the imposition of the hands of the apostles, for the purpose. Acts 8 : 17. "And they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit."—9 : 17.

It appears, therefore, that imposition of hands was practised in the ordination of church officers, in conformity with an ancient and time-honored custom of the Jews. The meaning and intent of this practice is sufficiently indicated, without explanation. It signified the solemn communication of official powers by the ordainers; and, as it was practised in connection with solemn prayer to God, it symbolized the communication of the Holy Spirit obtained in answer to prayer, and communicated from the intercessor to the object.

The imposition of hands, and the qualifications of the candidates, in the case of the first deacons, have led many to imagine that their ordination was to the ministry of the word. They were men of good repute, full of the Holy Spirit, and wisdom. But they were to be intrusted with the funds of the church, for charitable purposes, in a time of great interest; and their service of the church, in any way, would make important demands on them for religious knowledge and discretion. Without any official authority to preach the Gospel, they would naturally be called to be lay preachers and exhorters, to inculcate the lessons of the Gospel, and defend its principles in private and in public;

so that the highest qualifications would come into full use in a deaconship, which was mainly for the service of tables, that the ministry of the word might be left unencumbered, to devote itself exclusively to preaching and prayer.

The choice and ordination of the deacons at Jerusalem is the only instance of the choice and ordination of a church officer in the New Testament, besides that of the apostles. The candidate was elected by a popular assembly. In the case of Matthias, however, he was one of two candidates chosen by the assembly, and the election between them was referred to God by lot; while the original twelve were chosen by Christ. In the case of the deacons, the initiative is taken by the assembly, at the proposal of the apostles, and ordination is received from the apostles.

Here is a combination of democracy and ministerial authority. The choice of the people is democratic; the ordination by the ministry implies the power, on their part, to give or withhold their assent to the appointment of the people.

We have no account of the first institution of Christian church presbyters, or bishops, unless we find it in the office of the apostles. Nor is any mention made of them, under this title, previous to the pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The first mention of them by this name is after churches had been multiplied, and numerous appointments of this kind had already been made.

As the twelve apostles, however, take this title to themselves, and use it apparently as one of their official titles, I conclude that their office was, from the beginning, an episcopacy or presbytership; that the seventy disciples had a similar ordination and were clothed with similar powers, and that other presbyters and bishops were appointed, in different cities, to have charge of Christian disciples in them, from the commencement of Christ's ministry.

However this may be, the ordination of presbyters in every city by Paul and Barnabas, Acts 14: 23, and by Titus, 1; 5,

proves that a plurality of these officers was common in all the churches, even the smallest; and the analogy of the case, both to the election of Matthias and the seven deacons, requires us to suppose that the candidates were, in all cases, elected by the congregations, and ordained by preëxisting church officers.

It is said of Stephen, directly after his ordination to the deaconship of the church at Jerusalem, Acts 6: 8, that he was full of faith and power, and did great wonders and miracles among the people. He appears also to have been an occasion of a riot among the foreign Jews at Jerusalem, in consequence of which he was falsely accused before the supreme council of the nation, where he delivered the celebrated discourse recorded Acts 7: 1—53. This is one of the most extraordinary discourses on record, and marks the author as an able and powerful religious teacher.

He was interrupted, in the midst of this discourse, by his enemies, who rushed upon him with the greatest fury. At this awful moment, "Stephen, being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up steadfastly to heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said: I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. Enraged, by this declaration, to the utmost, his enemies seized him, cast him out of the city, and stoned him, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep." — Acts 7: 55—60.

This was the first Christian martyrdom after that of Christ, and the circumstances attending it were so remarkable, and the character and abilities of the martyr were so preëminent, that it is difficult to be satisfied that his office in the church was below that of a public religious instructor and preacher. The enemies of religion publicly disputing with him, Acts 6: 9, seems to imply that he acted as a public speaker and teacher; and his discourse before the Jewish council shows that he was abundantly able to teach and preach.

Directly after the death of Stephen, we are informed of Philip as preaching Christ. Acts 8 : 5—8. — "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ to them. And the people with one accord gave heed to those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with a loud voice, came out of many that were possessed; and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed." The same administered baptism to his converts. — v. 13, 16. He preached the Gospel to the Ethiopian eunuch, and baptized him. — Acts 8 : 26—40.

In Acts 21 : 8, Luke says: "And the next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came to Cesarea; and we entered into the house of Philip the *ευαγελιστου*, evangelist, being one of the seven, and abode with him." This is A. D. 60, after an interval of twenty-seven years from his appointment to the deaconship of the church at Jerusalem. Philip the deacon at Jerusalem, is Philip the evangelist at Cesarea.

The qualifications of deacons are described in 1 Tim. 3 : 8—13. — "The deacons, in like manner, must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, and not greedy of base gain; having the mystery of the faith, with a pure conscience. And these must first be proved. Then let them serve as deacons, being found faithful. So in like manner must the women be grave, not slanderers; sober, faithful in all things. For they that have served well as deacons procure for themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

On comparing these qualifications with those for the office of bishop and presbyter, we find them very similar; but there is some difference corresponding to the relation of principal and assistant, or to a superior and inferior grade of office. It is said that the bishop must be *apt to teach*, 1 Tim. 3 : 2; and in Titus 1 : 9, adhering to the true word as he has been taught, that he may be able, by sound instruction, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

It is only said of the deacons that they must hold the mystery of the faith (the doctrines of Christianity), with a pure conscience, that is, a holy life. — 1 Tim. 3 : 9.

On the whole, the New Testament doctrine of the deaconship is that of assistant ministers having charge, under the bishops and presbyters, of the temporalities of the church, but authorized, as assistant ministers, to perform the higher functions of preaching, exhorting and baptizing.

1 Tim. 3 : 13. — "They that have served well as deacons procure for themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith." The word, βαθμος, translated degree, was used by the fathers to denote an order or grade of office in the ministry; and was understood by them, as it is by many eminent modern commentators, to signify in this case higher grade, higher order; as much as to say, Those that serve well as deacons procure admission to the higher order of bishops and presbyters.

Dr. Thomas Scott says, in commenting on 1 Tim. 3 : 8—13, "The deacons were primarily appointed to dispense the charity of the church, and to manage its secular concerns. Yet they preached occasionally, or taught in private, or were readers in the public assemblies, and pastors and evangelists were chosen from among them. This interpretation has been contested, yet it seems to be the apostle's meaning; and, without adverting to modern habits and controversies, it is evident that the due discharge of the primitive office of deacon must tend to qualify men for the ministry.

"It also appears, from facts, that some deacons either were before preachers, or became so afterwards; nor is there any reason to think that persons were then regularly educated for the pastoral office, but ministers seem to have been always chosen from the most established and best qualified believers, and generally from those matured in years and experience [hence the Jewish title, presbyter-elder]. This does not, however, in any manner imply that a regular education is not, in the present state of things, the most expedient, and highly desirable."

The female deacons are supposed to have been appointed, in conformity with the local customs of the times, for the particular care and instruction of their sex. As is still the case in the East, females were very much excluded from promiscuous society, and cut off from the enjoyment of the general means of improvement. We hear of no female deacons in the church of Jerusalem. The social habits of the Jews may not have required them. These officers are met with among the Greeks, where they were, doubtless, necessary for the time. The female deacons may be presumed to have been assistant ministers, to aid the pastors in the care and instruction mainly of their own sex. It does not appear that the female deacons were ever advanced to the office of bishops and presbyters. Mention is made, in a few cases, of female deacons; but female bishops or presbyters were unknown to primitive Christianity.

Notice is taken of the ordination of presbyters in every church and city in two passages. Acts 14: 23, — "When they had ordained presbyters in every church," — and Titus 1: 5, — "For this purpose I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest put in order things that are wanting, and καταστασῃς, establish presbyters in every city." Crete was thickly settled, and had numerous cities or villages. A city was not necessarily a large place. The title was applicable alike to the smallest village and the largest emporium of trade and manufactures.

There is no such notice of the universal appointment of deacons.

They were appointed first in the church at Jerusalem, A. D. 33. — Acts 6: 1—6.

In Phil. 1: 1, they are mentioned as the second order of the ministry after the bishops, and the only order besides them in the church.

In 1 Tim. 3: 8—13, they are mentioned as the second and only order of church ministers after bishops.

The Διακονια, deaconship, is also mentioned in Rom. 12: 7, in the passage, "Or deaconship, let him wait on his deaconship."

These four passages are all the recognitions of the deaconship, as a distinct order of the Christian ministry, in the New Testament.

Besides these, the words deacon and deaconship are applied frequently to denote the highest order of ministers and ministrations; as in the following passages: 1 Cor. 3 : 5. — "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but *deacons* by whom ye have believed as God gave to each?" 2 Cor. 3 : 6. — "Who also has made us able deacons of the new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive." 6 : 4. — "In everything commending ourselves as deacons of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses," &c.

1 Thess. 3 : 2. — "We sent Timothy, our brother and deacon of God, and our co-laborer in the Gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to admonish you concerning your faith." 1 Tim. 4 : 6. — "If thou instruct the brethren in these things, thou shalt be a good deacon of Jesus Christ; nourished by the words of the faith, and of the good instruction which thou hast enjoyed."

Acts 1 : 17. — "For he (Judas) was numbered with us, and had the κληρον της διακονιας, *office of this deaconship*." Vs. 24, 25. — "Do thou, Lord, the searcher of all hearts, show which one of these two thou hast chosen to take the office of this *deaconship* and apostleship, from which Judas fell by transgression." 20 : 24. — "But I make account of nothing, neither do I regard my life dear to myself, that I may finish my course with joy, and the *deaconship* which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." 21 : 19. — "And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had performed among the Gentiles by his *deaconship*." Rom. 11 : 13. — "For I speak to you, Gentiles, inasmuch as I am an apostle of the Gentiles, I will magnify my *deaconship*." 1 Cor. 12 : 4—6. — "There are diversities of gifts, but the spirit is the same; and there are diversities of *deaconships*, but the Lord is the same; and there are diversities of effects, but the God who effecteth all things in all, is the same." 2 Cor. 4 : 1. — "Having, there-

fore, this deaconship, as we have obtained mercy we faint not." 5: 18. — "For all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the *deaconship* of reconciliation." 6: 2. — "Giving no offence in anything, that the *deaconship* be not blamed." Eph. 4: 11, 12. — "And he gave some prophets, and some apostles, some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the *deaconship*, for the edifying of the body of Christ." 1 Tim. 1: 12, 13. — "And I thank our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath given me ability, because he counted me faithful, putting me in the *deaconship*, who formerly was blasphemous, persecuting and injurious." 2 Tim. 4: 5. — "But, watch in all things, endure affliction, perform the work of an evangelist, exercise fully thy *deaconship*."

See, also, 2 Cor. 3: 7, 8, 9.

This general usage in regard to the words διακονος and διακονια, deacon and deaconship, favors the supposition that the order of ministers called by this name were assistant ministers, participating with their principals in the higher duties of the ministry, as well as in the lower.

The earliest notices that we have of these officers in the post-apostolic churches agree with this supposition, and imperatively demand it.

Ignatius describes the deacons as "intrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ; and not ministers of meat and drink, but of the church of God."

Polycarp says, "The deacons must be blameless as the ministers of God in Christ."

Eusebius makes no mention of deacons as a class of church officers, but divides the church into

1. The ηγουμενοι, the leaders.

2. The πιστοι, believers.

3. The κατηχουμενοι, catechumens, candidates for membership under instruction.

On a thorough examination of the New Testament, with

respect to this subject, we find two permanent orders of the Christian ministry.

1. The order of presbyters and bishops.

2. The order of assistant ministers having charge of the temporalities of the church, under the title of deacons.

At the head of the first order stand the apostles; and, in respect to the power of performing miracles to corroborate their testimony, they stand far above all other presbyters. In other respects even they assumed no superiority to this order generally, and exercised no diocesan episcopacy, or provincial patriarchate, or archepiscopacy over them. James, the brother of our Lord, was bishop or presbyter, with others, at Jerusalem; Peter, at Babylon; John, at Ephesus. Paul claimed no diocesan episcopacy over churches which he planted. While he was with them he preached to them the Gospel; when absent he wrote to them, and instructed and exhorted them, in respect to their duties; but he did not govern them.

In Ephesians 4: 11—13, we are told that Christ gave to some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

Pastor is another name for presbyter and bishop, as is evident from Acts 20: 28, where ποιμαινειν signifies to feed as a shepherd, to perform the office of a shepherd, to exercise a pastorate.

So in Rom. 12: 6—8. — "Having then gifts, differing according to the grace that is given to us, if prophecy, let us prophesy according to the analogy of faith; if deaconship, let us exercise the deaconship [let us be diligent in the deaconship]; or he that teacheth, in teaching; and he that exhorteth, in exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that προισταμενος, ruleth (or presideth), let him do it with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness."

Part of these are official duties, belonging to the office of the Christian ministry, and a part of them are general duties.

Prophets were special ministers, which, with the apostles, have ceased. Deacons were assistant ministers, and had charge of the temporalities of the church. The presbyters and bishops were teachers, exhorters and rulers, presiding over the congregations, moderating church meetings, conducting religious worship, and guiding the churches under their care by their advice and counsel. Especially did this character belong to the presiding pastor, where one was so preëminent as to be usually president. This must, of course, often have happened.

Having shown that the bishops and presbyters were the same, the word bishop being derived from Greek usage, and presbyter from Hebrew usage, but both applied to denote the co-pastors of churches, without any discrimination of rank or grade of office, it is important to determine, with as much precision as possible, the nature and extent of their authority and powers.

1. With the concurrence of their churches, they did everything that belongs to the *correct* administration of the greatest spiritual tyrant.

2. They preached the Gospel publicly, and inculcated all its doctrines and duties.

3. They administered the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper.

4. They visited and prayed for the sick.

5. They presided in meetings of the church for the exercise of discipline and the transaction of church business.

6. They ordained ministers of the word, and deacons, on the election of the churches.

7. They formed new churches, and, on the election of officers by the churches, ordained them.

8. Having the ordaining power, they had by this means a veto on the choice of the membership, if they did not find the candidates qualified for their offices.

While the power of deciding ultimately all questions of prin-

ciple and policy is recognized as belonging to the membership, it is to be presumed that the actual decisions would, in many cases, be made by the ministry, and the membership only appealed to in case of doubt or difficulty.

The original plan of a plurality of co-pastors, without thorough professional preparation for the ministerial office, is exchanged, in nearly all modern churches, for a single professional pastor, devoted exclusively to the work of the ministry, assisted in the congregational church by the deacons and others, as he may be able to enlist them in the service of the church; in the Presbyterian church, by ruling elders; in the Methodist Episcopal church, by class-leaders, &c. &c.

CHAPTER XIV.

NATURE OF THE CHURCH MINISTRY.

It does not appear, from the New Testament, that the Christian ministry was regarded as a priesthood. They were distinguished from the Jewish priesthood by different titles, and their office differs from that of the priesthood in not being hereditary, as well as in other important respects.

Christ is the Αρχιερευς (high priest) of the Christian dispensation. — Heb. 9: 11. Ιερευς μεγας, 10: 21, its great priest, and its only priest. He does not divide this office with any of his servants. He is the antitype of the Jewish priesthood, and accomplishes by his death all that the sacrifices of previous ages prefigured. Heb. 10: 12, 14. — "For this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God. For by one offering, he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." 9: 28. — "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Verse 26. — "Now once in the end of the

world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the offering of himself." — 7 : 1—28.

It is essential to a priesthood to offer sacrifices; but the Christian ministry is an office of instruction and supervision. The entire community of Christians is called a ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον (a holy priesthood), to offer spiritual sacrifices, well pleasing to God." — 1 Pet. 2 : 5. But this is to be understood figuratively, and is predicated of the membership equally with the ministry. In the same sense they are called, v. 9, Βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα (a royal priesthood).

Similar representations are made in Revelation. Rev. 1 : 6. — "To him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood, and made us a kingdom and priests to God even his Father, to him be glory and power for ever and ever. Amen." — 5 : 10; 20 : 6.

As early as the second century, the titles of the Jewish priesthood began to be applied to the Christian ministry, though at first only in a general way. Such an application, however, is not authorized by the New Testament.

The Papal church regards its presbyters as priests in the strictest sense, as offerers of the pretended sacrifice of the mass. The Episcopal churches regard their presbyters as priests in a general sense, as offering to God the public prayers of his people, interceding for them and blessing them.

It is not of material consequence what name is applied to denote an office, or an office-holder; but it is of the greatest importance that the nature of the offices of the Christian ministry should be correctly apprehended both by the ministry itself and the membership.

The distinction of clergy and laity appears in the New Testament, but they were not as yet designated by any general correlative terms.

The most general term to denote the clergy was that of διάκονος (deacon), and next to this, presbyter. The people were generally called ἅγιοι (saints), or πιστοί (believers).

At a later period, the Christian ministry were called κληρικοι, changed through the French into clergy; and the membership λαος, laity. In agreement with this, we have the words clergyman and layman, and the adjectives clerical and laic.

The clergy having been the principal writers of the dark ages, their title, in the form of the word clerk, has come, in modern times, to denote any one who is employed to keep accounts in public or private offices.

The office of the Christian ministry in the apostolic churches was mainly an office of instruction, admonition and moral improvement. The church ministry were the spiritual guides of the membership. Their business was to lead them by the still waters and into the green pastures of practical holiness. Primitive preaching was less elaborate than this service is generally required to be now. It was for the most part expository and hortatory; to a great extent argumentative and practical. It aimed to convert to the faith, and to advance the membership in piety and virtue.

The qualifications of bishops and presbyters did not comprehend a liberal education. Many of the ministers of the post-apostolic churches were men of eminent learning; but eminent learning was not essential to an induction into this office, nor was it common.

It was the policy of the churches, from the beginning, to supply themselves with pastors from the best candidates they had. They did not send all over the world for pastors, but took such as resided among themselves. It was in this way that Paul and Silas were able to ordain presbyters in every church, and Titus in every city in Crete.

The churches were, from the beginning, the patrons of learning and refinement, and learning was deemed highly important, and received the greatest encouragement, in the ministry; but it was not deemed essential, and is not even mentioned in the apostolic lists of qualifications for the office of bishop and presbyter.

A bishop was not required to be a learned man; yet he must

be apt to teach; and he must not be a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he should fall into the condemnation of the devil; that is, the condemnation and sin of pride from undue exaltation; the same into which the devil fell, and by which he became an apostate.

Wesley, the founder of Methodism, found it necessary to resort to the same policy, in laying the foundations of his order. Wherever his disciples and adherents were multiplied, he found it necessary to provide for their spiritual care and instruction, by appointing pastors and teachers over them, the best that he could find. These were not generally liberally-educated men; but they were men usually of good natural abilities, good common sense, great zeal for the glory of God, and the advancement of his kingdom; and most of them were men that could learn by experience, observation and study.

CHAPTER XV.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS RESPECTING THE CHURCH UNDER THE APOSTLES.

1. The church of Christ was preëminently an original institution. The like had never existed before. Religion had been associated with the family and the state, and had been made a part of both; but never before had it been made the basis of an independent association. It was a most sublime conception, worthy of its divine origin, to form a society for religious purposes, and to commit to it the supervision and promotion of the religious cultivation and interests of mankind. The magnitude of the interests involved required that they should be separated alike from the family and the state, and made the sole object of a society. This was commenced by Christ in person, and carried completely into effect by his disciples, in pursuance of his

instructions. It was done with little parade and noise, but it was done effectually, and the world is still waiting to receive untold blessings from that arrangement.

2. The church of Christ was most unimposing in its appearance. It contradicted popular opinions, it discarded popular prejudices, it anathematized popular sins, and propounded a most exalted standard of piety and virtue. But it resorted to no violence for the support of its faith, or the punishment of its adversaries. It drew no sword, it bent no bow; no deadly arrow trembled on its strings. It battled for the true, and good, and glorious; but its weapons were arguments, virtues, happiness gained, and glory in prospect. It called men to a new life; to most exalted aims, to most heroic endeavors, to most sublime achievements. It proposed to renovate the world, and to purge out of it the leaven of impiety and wickedness. It brought new and clear revelations of God, of a future state of consciousness and retribution after death, of eternal life to the good, and eternal death to the wicked. Besides revealing the Son of God as having been once on earth in the flesh, signifying his presence by the most amazing displays of divine power and love, it revealed the Holy Spirit in his absence of limitation with respect to form, as now in the world, moving on the minds of men, inclining them to the true and good, and aiding them effectually in its pursuit.

There was little in the appearance of the church that was terrific or alarming to its enemies;-but, at its touch, crowns crumbled and thrones fell. Senates could not arrest its progress, nor embattled hosts withstand its assaults. It took possession of the world as rapidly almost as Joshua took possession of Canaan, and resistance was as ineffectual against it as against him. Though organized with special reference to making extensive conquests, its appearance and pretensions were most humble. What was it? It was a society of Christians observing the Christian Sabbath, and meeting statedly on that day for divine worship and religious instruction. It was a society of Christians pledging

themselves to do all that is right and good, but to do no wrong. It was a local society. It was a limited society. It formed no extensive combinations, and claimed no extensive jurisdictions. It had no universal combinations, like the Roman Catholics; no national establishment, like the Church of England; no provincial establishment. It had only city and congregational societies. Its first society was at Jerusalem, and extended no further. It then formed other independent societies in Judea and other parts of Palestine. It then went to other parts of the Roman empire, and to other empires, and formed its societies there. It asked no favors, and accepted no bribes. It had no universal bishop, or spiritual sovereign, but Christ. It had no universal court, but that of the Judge of living and dead. It had no national or provincial bishops, and no national or provincial societies; all its societies were of single cities, or other limited districts, which allowed the members to meet together for religious purposes. Hence its name *Εκκλησια*, *church*, an assembly, those who usually meet together for religious and ecclesiastical purposes.

3. Each of these limited and local societies was independent of all the rest, and of all the world. Each of them was a church of God, a province in his divine kingdom, subject only to him, and under him possessing all the rights of spiritual sovereignty; the legislative, judicial and executive. It made laws conformably to the word of God, for the spiritual government of its members; it tried offenders, and admonished, rebuked, or excommunicated the guilty; and it administered all its affairs without any dictation from abroad. The church at Jerusalem does not domineer over the church at Antioch, nor the church at Rome over other churches in Italy or Greece. Each church attends to its own concerns, settles its own principles, appoints its own officers, and disciplines its members, with no interference from abroad, and no review or control of distant superior church courts. The action of every church is final in respect to its members. Peter issues no Papal bulls, Paul performs no excommunications, but urges the membership to do this, where it is required.

The instances in which discipline seems to be administered by the ministry, as in Tit. 3: 10, "A heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject," must be interpreted in a qualified sense to agree with Matt. 18: 17; 1 Cor. 5: 4, 12, 13, &c., which assign this duty explicitly to the church. All the apostles conspire to exalt the church, and to abase themselves, as not the lords, but the ministers and servants of the churches. Many things, in Paul's directions to Timothy and Titus, might be understood as agreeing with the supposition that they were diocesan bishops; but several of those directions, as that concerning excommunicating heretics, must be understood in a qualified sense. Nor is there anything in these epistles that may not be explained in harmony with the Congregational theory of the primitive church ministry and government.

The proofs of that theory being decisive, anything that appears to be against it, and admits of an explanation in consistency with it, must, by all the established laws of interpretation, be so explained. This consideration fully removes all the objections to the Congregational theory of the primitive church ministry, arising from things in the directions of Paul to Timothy and Titus. None of these are inexplicable on the Congregational theory. None of them require forced interpretations, to bring them into harmony with it. But the passages which teach the Congregational theory are many of them decisive, and admit no other possible interpretation.

4. The apostolic churches were congregational in respect to the form of their government.

The evidence of this is decisive, and some of it may be here recapitulated:

(1.) Matt. 18: 17. — "And if he neglect to hear them, tell it to the church; and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and publican." This direction requires cases of discipline to be brought before the church, not the church session, or any other church court. Christ does not appoint his ministers judges in such matters, but devolves the office of judging on the

membership. This makes the church meeting a spiritual court for the trial of offenders, and the exercise of church discipline.

By a parity of reasoning, we infer that the church ought to have jurisdiction over other matters pertaining to its well-being. If the church is the supreme court of law, it ought also to be supreme in respect to spiritual legislation.

(2.) The council of Jerusalem on the subject of circumcision was composed of the apostles, and elders, and the whole church. Yet this body decided one of the highest questions of doctrine and policy that belonged to those times. A body that could decide this question could decide any question that is possible to be decided by ecclesiastical authority.

(3.) Paul enjoins the exercise of discipline on *the church*, not on church officers. 1 Cor. 5 : 3—5. — "For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I was present, him that hath so done this deed, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

This passage represents the trial and condemnation of an offender, in a general church meeting.

So verse 7 says to the church, the membership, not its officers, "Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new-made mass as ye are unleavened."

V. 13. — "Therefore put away from among you that wicked person."

Timothy and Titus are charged to perform faithfully the various duties of the Christian ministry, but they are nowhere charged to govern or discipline the churches to which they ministered. This is not to be accounted for on the supposition that they were absolute spiritual governors of the church; and it clearly implies that, in the church constitutions of those days, the churches retained the function of government in their own

hands, and that it was exercised on democratic and republican principles.

All these facts are very remarkable, almost unaccountable and incredible; but they are facts, and have an important significance. This peculiar organization was accidental or designed. It cannot have been accidental. What kind of a constitution and organization to give his church, must have been an object of thought to the Saviour and to his apostles. The peculiar organization, therefore, which they did give it, must have been designed; and it must have been preferred to all other conceivable and possible methods of organization, as on the whole the best.

This scheme of organization was very foreign to the spirit of those times, which generally favored hereditary despotisms. But still it was not entirely unprecedented. The Israelitish commonwealth under Moses, and thence to the time of Saul, was a republic, not a monarchy. The priesthood was hereditary, but the government of the country was elective and representative, the sovereign power residing, under God, ultimately in the people, not in the magistracy.

The establishment of a hereditary monarchy, when proposed, was deprecated by Samuel, as less desirable than their previous elective system. Their resort to monarchy was regarded by him as a relapse, a retrogradation, from the better to the worse; and so it proved.

Jesus Christ returns to the original principles of Moses, in respect to government, and organizes a democracy. But this is not all. He does not stop with reducing his church to a democracy, and uniting its limited democracies in a general, well-compacted republic. He had a precedent for doing this, in the union of the twelve tribes of Israel under a single central control. But he leaves all its local democracies disunited and independent, except as they all unite under himself, and depend on him alone. In this his scheme is perfectly original, and without a precedent either in Judaism or the rest of the world.

The plan of Christ was so foreign to the general ideas of expediency entertained in his times, and subsequently, that his followers deemed it imperfect, and requiring amendment; and, almost immediately after the death of the apostles, began that series of changes and innovations in church polity, which resulted in catholicity and despotism. The same churches that began as the most radical democracies, each separate Christian society independent of all the world, in the course of six centuries became gradually consolidated into a few great despotisms, governed by self-perpetuating hierarchies, under which every spark of rational liberty was extinguished. The principal of these was the Papal church in the West, and the Greek church in the East. Besides these, the Armenian, Nestorian, Coptic and Abyssinian churches, experienced similar transformations.

These changes were not the result of defective organization, but of misapprehension and delusion, combined with ambition and avarice, on the part of ecclesiastics. God's plan was not understood, and not appreciated; and the lusts of power and of gain, on the part of church officers, demanded the greatest possible departure from it. Neither ought any in the review to be surprised at this. As in the department of morality there are but two points of rest, the state of perfect holiness or that of perfect sin, so in the department of government, there are but two conditions of stability:

1. That of the most perfect liberty.

2. That of the most perfect and absolute despotism possible.

The revolution in the Christian church from liberty to despotism, in the case of all the ancient churches, is one of the darkest pages in human history. It is as if the last hope of the liberties and religion of the human race had failed, and man's general reformation and recovery to virtue, dignity and happiness, had been found impossible.

But this is not so. Christianity is not a failure, though these experiments with it are failures. They are preliminary trials towards the solution of the great problem of the world's entire

redemption, and will ultimately contribute to that result, just as the previous failure of the experiments with Judaism did. The Jewish experiments failed, but the spirit and principles of the thing itself survived, and were reproduced in Christianity. So the experiments of the ancient Christian churches have failed, but the spirit and principles of Christianity have survived, and are reproduced and perpetuated in the renovated churches of the Protestant reformation; and a new course of more successful experiments, on better principles, and with brighter prospects, is already begun.

(4.) The churches of Christ were free organizations with respect to their origin, no less than with respect to their government. No charter was issued to Peter, to all the apostles, or to any body of men whatever, giving them exclusive rights to organize churches. Peter and other apostles organized churches, but not in virtue of any chartered rights for that purpose. Paul and Barnabas, and other Christian ministers and laymen, organized churches in the same way. And, without an organizing minister, if men embraced the Gospel and formed themselves into churches after the fashion of those planted by the apostles, they were recognized as entitled to all the honors and privileges of other churches.

Such is the New Testament theory with respect to founding and instituting churches. The right to form churches is without restriction of any kind. Therefore it belongs equally to all men, just like the right to found states and nations. Whenever a state or nation is needed, and men have the power, they have the right to form one. And whenever a new church is judged to be necessary, those that are willing to unite in the enterprise, and have the power, have the right to do so. Nor is this all. They are under a moral obligation to do it, both in regard to nations and churches. Whenever men judge the organization of new churches, or churches on new principles, to be necessary, and have the power to form and sustain them, they have the right; not by virtue of written charters, but in conformity with

universal and eternal principles. These principles are the same, and of equal validity, both with respect to states and churches.

The fellowship of different Christian churches with each other was analogous to that of independent and friendly states. They loved one another, dismissed and received members to and from one another, contributed for the relief of each other's poor, contributed jointly to send the Gospel to the heathen, and extend its conquests, and took advice and counsel of each other in difficulty. By the same rule, they must have remonstrated with each other in case of real or supposed wrongs of an aggravated character, and for good reason must have had the right to withdraw all fellowship from offending churches, and that according to their own judgments respectively.

The Episcopalian theory of the organization of churches is that they are formed only in the exercise of exclusive chartered rights, given for the purpose to the apostles at first, and handed down by tradition from them to their successors, so that a valid church organization requires an unbroken chain of tradition back to the apostles. If one link in the chain is defective, all the organizations that follow, however correct in form or pure in principle, are without valid authority, and are not lawful churches. This view is supported by references to Masonic lodges and other close societies, such as the Sons of Temperance, Rechabites, &c.

But these references are not to the point, with respect to Christian churches after the plan of the New Testament. Those churches were not close societies, extending and multiplying themselves in a specific mode, and uniting the members of each, under a single government. They were open societies, which anybody that wished might form at any time, and in any place. In this respect they may be compared to open temperance societies, or to open benevolent societies. The right of their formation is not restricted to other societies of the kind, or to any body, but is universal as the human race.

There is no restriction, in respect to the formation of churches,

in the New Testament. There ought not to be any. The right to form churches ought to be as free as the right to form states. What would be thought of an attempt to found the authority of states on tradition, from preëxisting or coëxisting states? It would be a revival of the pernicious and exploded doctrine of the divine right of kings, repugnant to all just sentiments of liberty, and at war with all just principles of government and common sense.

Such as I have now sketched was the plan of Christ, in respect to the organization of the church; such was the church he organized, and such he requires his church still to be. He may bear, for a time, with deviations from his plan; but he cannot approve them, he cannot give them his sanction.

The sacred tabernacle, in the time of Moses, was required to be built according to the pattern shown in the mount; and the church of Christ, in all ages, is required to be constituted according to the pattern shown by Christ and the apostles, and delineated in the New Testament. The church of the New Testament is our pattern tabernacle in the mount. No deviation is allowed; not the least. None can be made without injury. Infinite wisdom cannot be instructed, and divine perfection cannot be improved.

The plan of instituting many local churches, instead of one universal church, and of leaving the right of organizing churches entirely unrestricted, deserves particular consideration. Were its advantages less obvious than they are, it would be the height of presumption to decide against it, as certainly undesirable. But its manifest advantages are great.

A church that is extended without division, by originating new branches, making all subject to a common central supreme authority, is more liable to corruption and maladministration than independent churches, or a church that is extended only by other independent organizations, formed after a similar model. There is a beautiful analogy in nature to support this view. There are many trees and shrubs that can be propagated by slips. The

slip that is left on the parent stem becomes a branch. But remove it, and let it become a tree, and it will be far nobler, larger, and more productive of all its appropriate fruits, than it could be as a branch. So a church that extends itself by branches may be important. But let it extend itself by slips and seeds, and it will be far more important.

The Christian church was a tree planted and growing from the seed of the word of God. It was not organized to grow and extend itself by branches through the whole world, but by slips and seeds, the product of each slip and seed being an independent tree, having all the capabilities and powers of the first tree from which it was taken.

In its beginning, its seed was a single germ, capable of producing a single stalk; but, in the process of ages, the whole world is overspread and covered with plants of this kind, and filled with their beauteous flowers and wholesome fruits.

But men misapprehended the divine plan, and thought that one enormous tree filling the world would be better than an infinite number of separate trees. They therefore took measures to reduce the numerous trees of the early Christian planting to as few as possible, by uniting them together, and to prohibit the formation of any new ones by slips or seeds. The result has been the monster Greek and Roman churches, with a few others less important, the general corruption of Christian faith and morals, the introduction and support of vast systems of the most puerile superstition and delusion, and the substitution of the most absolute and cruel despotisms for the genial liberty and love of ancient times.

A departure from the plan of Christ, in respect to church polity, which was early commenced, and has been steadily persisted in to the present time, is believed to have been the cause of incalculable evils to the church itself and to the world. It was predicted in revelation that the chaste spouse of Christ should, in the process of time, be driven into the wilderness, there to remain in retirement and obscurity twelve hundred and sixty

years. — Rev. 12 : 1—17. It was also predicted that her place should be occupied by a *vile harlot*, arrayed in purple and scarlet, decorated with gold and precious stones, drinking to drunkenness the blood of saints and martyrs, reigning over the kings of the earth, and causing its inhabitants to be made drunk with her abominable wickedness and cruelty. — Rev. 17 : 1—18.

But this harlot was to be finally destroyed, and the pure church of God brought out of the wilderness and crowned with transcendent glories.

The pure spouse of Christ is his church, with its primitive apostolic organization and polity. The Babylonian harlot of corruption is the Papal church, so modified and altered from the divinely-constructed model of primitive times as to be the prolific mother of all possible abominations, and as entirely unlike the original, whose honors it claims, as the unprincipled and overbedecorated harlot is unlike the chaste wife and pious mother.

The Greek and other Eastern churches are in the same corruption as the Papacy, and belong to the same spiritual Babylon.

PART II.

THE POST-APOSTOLIC CHURCH; OR, THE CHURCH AFTER THE APOSTLES, FROM A. D. 100 TILL 606.

CHAPTER I.

THE GREAT EXPERIMENT: THE RISE OF DIOCESAN EPISCOPACY.

"BEWARE lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the elements of the world, and not after Christ." — Col. 2 : 8.

The organization of the Christian church was the grandest experiment on the capabilities of man, and the best-conceived scheme for his improvement as an individual, and the improvement of society generally, that had ever been tried. It was simple, original, universally practicable, and of complete efficiency, if men could be inspired with its high aspirations, and permanently controlled by its principles. It was the last of a series of experiments under the direct supervision of the Almighty, and adapted to meet those difficulties which the others had failed to meet, and to accomplish fully the sublime and beneficent objects which the others had accomplished but partially.

But, humanly speaking, it must be brought to the test of experiment before its wisdom and efficiency could appear. Great pains was taken to give this momentous experiment a chance of success. The accumulated wisdom and experience of all previous ages was brought to bear upon it. It was proclaimed as the

kingdom of God and of the redeemed, and the divinely-constituted university for the education of God's children in the principles and laws of holiness and happiness.

God descended in the person of Jesus Christ, laid aside for a time his transcendent glories, and appeared in the unimposing garb of humanity, both to make expiation for our sins, and to settle the principles and order of his divine kingdom on earth.

He expounded the previous systems of Moses and the earlier patriarchs, relieving them from the perversions and misapprehensions which ages of darkness and ignorance had superinduced, and set forth his own system of holiness as essentially the same with theirs. He called all men to come to him, submit to his authority, receive his instruction, and unite in the support and promotion of his cause. Before him all met on an equal level. The monarch came down, the peasant came up; or, rather, all conditions and all ranks and orders of men were required to take their places in the dust together before their God, and pay him their united and loving homage. Obedience was encouraged by the promise of everlasting life, and disobedience discouraged by denunciations of endless woe.

The Redeemer himself was the great corner-stone of the fabric which he came to erect. It all rests on him as our divine Lord and King, shown to be so by the most certain and indubitable proofs.

Christ is first proclaimed as Lord and King, and demonstrated to be such, 1. By prophecy. 2. By his own stupendous and numerous miracles. 3. By the power which he conferred on the apostles, and others, of performing miracles. 4. By the divine purity and excellence of his doctrines.

On this rational faith in his lordship, his kingship, is erected his kingdom, the church. As a kingdom, it has its laws and officers. Its laws are the holy Scriptures, its officers are the Christian ministry, and its sole king and head is the Lord Jesus Christ.

The apostles were largely endowed with the Holy Spirit, to

enable them to superintend the progress and extension of the church after Christ's ascension, and return to the spiritual world. How far they were left to their discretion in the institutes which they adopted, and how far they enjoyed special and specific divine direction, we are not informed; but, as the Holy Spirit was promised to lead them into all truth, we cannot doubt that the promise was fulfilled, and that all their appointments were such as met the approbation of their divine Lord. The same miraculous powers which evinced the divinity of Christ, and proved by the sanction of Omnipotence the truth of his claims and teachings, evinced also the divine authority of the apostles as ministers of Christ, and officers under him, to settle the order and institutes of his kingdom. During the lives of the apostles, the church was fully established, and local churches numerously instituted. But, even then, the devil was abroad sowing tares among the wheat, and the apostles were in repeated instances put on the defensive for the maintenance of their establishments in purity and power. But, no sooner had they passed away and gone to their rest, than the work of corruption began, under the specious and deceptive title of improvement. The divine institutions had to be *improved*, to adapt them to the new exigences which arose. Hence a course of innovations was commenced, which were small and apparently unimportant at first, and perhaps really so but for the principle which they involved; but which grew and multiplied with the lapse of time, till, in a few brief centuries, they resulted in the great Western and Eastern apostasies; the Papacy of the West, and the Patriarchates of the East.

These apostasies retained the name and profession of Christianity, as the Jews of the time of Christ did that of disciples of Moses, and the Old Testament prophets; but they lost the spirit of their profession, no less than the Jews had done. They were Papists, Greek churchists, Nestorians, Armenian churchists, Coptic and Abyssinian churchists; but they were not Christians. They had forsaken Christ for other masters; and he had for-

saken them. Genuine piety and virtue were supplanted by cruel and gloomy superstitions; knowledge and liberty, by soul-crushing spiritual despotism; and the spiritual and holy church of Christ, as seen in the apocalypse, clothed with the sun, having the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars, a kingdom of love, of purity, of peace; was transmuted into the Roman harlot, arrayed in purple and scarlet, decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, with a golden cup in her hand, but full of the most loathsome and pestiferous corruptions, and drinking to drunkenness the blood of the saints and martyrs.

To write out fully and minutely the process of this great apostasy, and to trace it step by step, in its progress, would require volumes. I shall present only the leading and most prominent particulars.

The Rise of Diocesan Episcopacy.

The first great change that appears in the church subsequent to the age of the apostles has respect to the organization and powers of the Christian ministry, the separation of bishops and presbyters as distinct orders of ministers, and their exaltation above the laity as spiritual despots, having absolute authority over the church. Nothing of this appears in the New Testament, nor did it exist under the supervision of the apostles. The apostles themselves did not claim absolute lordship over the churches in which they presided, but submitted the most important ecclesiastical questions to the decision of the entire membership, ministry and laity, sitting and acting together as a single body.

But, immediately after the death and removal of the apostles, in the second century, the organization of the ministry was attempted to be improved, by the separation of bishops and presbyters into higher and lower orders of clergy. These officers had originally been of a single order, with equal powers, but unequal in respect to their labors and services, and also in respect

to their qualifications and positions. Some presided over large churches, others over small ones. Some preached, and others only presided over church affairs, without preaching, but officiated in reading the Scriptures, in offering public prayer, administering the church sacraments, and the general care of souls. In this they were assisted by the membership. — 1 Cor. 14 : 16.

All the considerable churches had a plurality of ministers, called bishops and presbyters indifferently. In the course of the second century, a presiding minister became distinguished from the rest, under the title of *Επισκοπος*, bishop, and the rest were called presbyters. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 71.

Each city and village had its bishop. Even down to the fourth century, the bishop of Antioch was the pastor of a single congregation. His presbyters assisted him by preaching at different hours in the day to the same congregation to which he preached. Chrysostom assisted him in this capacity previous to his becoming bishop of Constantinople. He was made deacon at Antioch, A. D. 381, and presbyter, 385. His elevation to the patriarchate of Constantinople was in 398. At this time the bishop of Antioch was patriarch or metropolitan bishop of Syria, calling and moderating provincial councils in that portion of the church. — Presbyterian Quarterly Review, vol. III., No. 1, 1854.

Bingham furnishes a list of some fifteen hundred episcopal *sees* in the fourth century, many of which were small, obscure places. Palestina Prima, the southern half of Palestine, of which Jerusalem was the metropolis, had twenty-nine dioceses, among which were the little villages of Majuma Lydda and Emmaus. Dora and Cesarea were five miles apart; Lydda and Joppa, six; Gaza, Majuma and Anthedon, three. Other bishops lived from four to ten miles apart. Italy was divided into seventeen provinces, each of which contained numerous episcopal charges, with their bishops. The province of Fuscia and Umbria, between the Tiber and the Tuscan sea, contained thirty-five episcopal charges, of which Portus, Sylva, Candida, Nepi, Aqua

Viva, Phalaris, Ferentinum, and Civita Vecchia, are examples. There was a bishop of Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, sixteen miles from Rome; less than two miles from this village, at Portus Romanus, was another; and two miles in the opposite direction, was the bishop of Sylva Candida. The bishops of Phalaris and Hortinum were nine miles apart, with the bishop of Nepi between them. Subaugusta, Tusculum, Velitræ and Signia, each had their bishops as neighboring parish ministers. So had Suessa, Calenum, and other small villages.

The province of Valeria had twelve episcopal charges, among which were Fidenæ, Nomentum, Tiber and Præneste. Fidenæ was five miles from Rome, and the rest usually but a few miles apart. The church of Tiber was four miles from that of Præneste; that of Sabinum, three miles from that of Reate. Those of Petinum, Amiternum and Furconium, were still nearer together. Yet the presiding ministers in all these churches were bishops.

The apostolical constitution of Alexandria, containing the early polity of that church, A. D. 200, informs us that, whenever twelve men demand a bishop, and appropriate means for his support, they may have one; clearly proving that the bishop of that time and country was a parish minister.

When Gregory Thaumaturgus became bishop of Cesarea, in Pontus, A. D. 239, his church numbered seventeen persons. These constituted his episcopal diocese. In the first origin of bishops, that order was elevated but a little above the presbyters. In churches which had several co-pastors, with equal powers, the bishops were the presiding pastors. But in the large cities, where the churches became divided into different congregations, having their separate places of worship, and these congregations became numerous, instead of organizing each congregation into an independent church, with its bishop, they retained the whole under a single superintendency; and this superintendency naturally devolving on the presiding minister, led to his ultimately

becoming exalted far above his co-pastors. — Presbyterian Quarterly Review, vol. III., No. 1, 1854.

So far were the pastors, at the close of the first century, from having usurped all power and authority in religious matters, that baptism was allowed to be administered by the laity. Whoever made converts baptized them, or were at liberty to do so. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 87, P. 8.

The exaltation of the ministry to be lords over God's heritage, in the place of its servants, began gradually and almost imperceptibly, and was undertaken and carried forward, in the majority of cases, no doubt, without any intention of wounding the purity of religion, or obscuring its glories. It was thought to be an improvement required by the circumstances of the cases in which it occurred, and was adoped and acquiesced in as such. The Jewish economy, with its priesthood, was thought to afford hints for the improvement of the Christian ministry; and Jewish precedent was allowed to have great weight in questions of expediency respecting Christian church polity.

The bishops took the position of high-priests, and assigned the presbyters that of the common priests among the Jews. This is the origin of the Christian priesthood in the persons and office of the Christian ministry, an idea foreign to the New Testament, and inconsistent with primitive Christianity. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 17, P. 4; and page 118, note 3.

The separation of bishops from presbyters was, at first, slight. In the large city churches, the bishops were the presiding presbyters or moderators of the ministerial colleges, having a slight precedence in rank and office, and nothing more. Each church came to have one bishop, and the large churches several collegiate and slightly subordinate ministers. Soon the bishops of the greater city churches, however, began to take precedence of others.

At first, no bishop claimed jurisdiction beyond his own city.

CHAPTER II.

THE PROVINCIAL COUNCILS: THEIR ORIGIN AND EFFECT.

The ancient provincial councils were conventions of bishops for ecclesiastical purposes. These judicatories among the Greeks were called synods, and among the Romans councils. The Greeks had been accustomed, from an early period, to the political confederation of cities. This usage had been found highly useful in respect to political affairs, and probably suggested to them a similar confederation of churches. Accordingly, we find that the provincial councils, and a confederation of churches, belonging to the same province, through their bishops, first arose among the Greeks, and was introduced from Greece into Syria, Palestine and the rest of the Christian world. At this time, each church had its bishop. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 116, 117; P. 1—3.

The earliest provincial councils of which we have any authentic information were those which deliberated concerning the Montanists, A. D. 170. The next were those which deliberated concerning the proper time for observing the annual festival since denominated Easter, which is the festival of the Epiphany, observed in commemoration of Christ's resurrection. All these councils are placed by Eusebius under the reign of Commodus, A. D. 180—192, near the close of the second century.

In the third century, councils became frequent, and were extended throughout a large part of the Christian world. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 116, note 2.

The provincial councils were convened in the principal city of the province. They were attended by all the bishops, and the bishop of the city where the council was held, was moderator. In

some provinces, councils were held annually; in others, twice a year. In process of time, the presiding bishop came to be a metropolitan, or archbishop, having a general superintendence over the rest; and the place of his residence became the spiritual metropolis of his province. At first, the provincial councils did not interfere with the private matters of single churches, but deliberated on matters of general interest, and the attending bishops were considered as representatives of their churches. At first, they had no jurisdiction, but were a kind of general conference, to consider, and, as far as possible, agree on matters of general interest. But they soon claimed power from Christ to bind and control their churches, and enacted laws for that purpose. Their laws were denominated canons, and in course of time were greatly multiplied.

Out of the provincial council grew, in process of time, the so-called general council.

No sooner had the bishops obtained an entire supremacy, and proportionably depressed the presbyters, than the metropolitan bishops raised themselves above the other bishops, and those of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, above all the rest, in consequence of the commanding position and influence of their churches. Rome, as the mistress of the world, gave its bishop the primacy in the church. This primacy was not derived from Peter, nor from any institution of Christ, or the apostles; but from the distinguished position of its bishop as pastor of the ruling city of the world, and perhaps of its largest, ablest and most influential church.

Bishops now began to be considered the especial successors of the apostles, and to claim much more than apostolic power and authority. They made large encroachments both on the rights of the presbyters and of the laity. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 163—165.

Under Constantine, the first Christian emperor, the church assumed a new aspect. It was before persecuted, it was now favored, by the state. Constantine was by birth a Dacian.

Being obliged to compete with powerful rivals for the supreme power, he adopted the cross as the standard of his army, and identified his cause with that of Christianity. The result was, that he easily vanquished his adversaries, and, in A. D. 324, became sole master of the Roman empire. He continued to reign in great glory till his death, A. D. 337. His first assumption of the title and powers of Cæsar had been in A. D. 305. He was not happy in his family; and, though the friend and patron of the church, and, by the general consent of the ecclesiastical authorities, its virtual head, he did not receive baptism till a short time before his death, and was then baptized by the Arian bishop Eusebius.

He changed the system of Roman jurisprudence, and altered, in many respects, the constitution of the empire. He modified, also, the polity of the church, to make it agree, as nearly as possible, with that of the state. The bishops of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, and afterwards the bishop of Constantinople, were raised to a princely rank and dignity, and subsequently received the title of patriarchs. Other bishops were raised to be the spiritual heads of provinces, and of subordinate divisions of the empire. The Christian Sabbath received the sanction of the Roman law, and every possible facility was afforded to the bishops to regulate things according to their judgment and pleasure. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 231—236.

CHAPTER III.

GENERAL COUNCILS.

CONSTANTINE, on adopting Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire, made some changes in its polity. He took upon himself a general superintendence of the church, and added to

the system of provincial councils, that of general councils. The object of general councils was to determine all questions of doctrine or discipline affecting the church generally, or pertaining to the general principles of Christianity. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 231.

The First General Council.

The first general council was that of Nice, in Bithynia, in 325. There is some doubt whether this council met on the 20th of May, or the 19th of June. It closed its sessions on the 24th of July, on the day that Constantine celebrated the twentieth year of his reign. It was held in the central hall of the imperial palace at Nice, one of the residences of the emperor, and consisted of three hundred and eighteen bishops, convened by call of the emperor, conveyed to the place of meeting, supported there, and carried home, at his expense. It was attended and opened by the emperor in person; yet he did not dictate to the bishops their decisions, but allowed them to debate the matters that came before them most freely, and to decide according to their ideas of truth and duty. He regarded and treated them as divinely-constituted judges of church matters. It does not appear that this council kept any journal of its proceedings. The results only to which they came were made matters of record, which were the creed, twenty canons, and an epistle to the African churches on the subject of Arianism.

The canons settled several principles of church order and discipline.

The epistle to the African churches announces the condemnation of Arius and Arianism, and sustains the divinity of Christ.

The Nicene creed is as follows: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten (that is) of the substance of the Father, by whom all things were made that are in heaven, and that are in earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, descended and was incarnate, and became man, suf-

fered and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens, and will come to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit. But those who say there was a time when he was not, and that he was not before he was begotten, and that he was made out of nothing, or affirm that he is of any other substance or essence, or that the Son of God is created and mutable or changeable, the Catholic church doth pronounce accursed." — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 291—295. Gieseler and the Encyclopedia Americana on the Council of Nice.

Under Constantine, the bishop of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, and, subsequently, after the removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople, the bishops of Constantinople were called Patriarchs, and divided the Christian world, to a great extent, among them. Subsequently, the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople swallowed up the others.

The Second General Council.

The council of Constantinople, assembled by the Greek emperor Theodosius the Great, in A. D. 331, was composed of one hundred and fifty bishops, from all parts of the Eastern Roman empire.

The first canon of this council respects the creed, which is as follows:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father, before all ages, light of light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, of the same nature as the Father, by whom are all things. For the sake of us men, and for the sake of our salvation, he descended from heaven, became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the virgin Mary, and became man. He was crucified for us by Pontius Pilate; he suffered, was buried, and arose from the dead the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and again will come in glory to judge the living and dead, of whose kingdom there will be no end; and in one Holy Spirit, the Lord,

the author of life, which proceedeth from the Father, and ruleth with the Father and the Son, and is glorified with them, that speaketh by the prophets; in one holy Catholic apostolic church. We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins, we expect the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

The second canon of this council confines the bishops to their provinces, and the third gives to the bishop of Constantinople the rank of second patriarch. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 306, 307, note 64.

The Third General Council.

The council of Ephesus was called by Theodosius II., A. D. 431. Bishops were present at this council from Egypt and all parts of the Eastern empire, and from Italy and Sicily. This council was called on account of the supposed heresy of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, in regarding the divine and human natures in Christ as distinct, and constituting different substances, but not different persons. The council was attended by a commissioner on the part of the emperor. Nestorius was condemned, not from the Scriptures, but from the fathers, by a faction opposed to him, before all the members had arrived. Subsequently, the council was divided; a part, with the imperial commissioner, favoring Nestorius, and a part insisting that he ought to be condemned. The proceedings of this council were characterized by shameful irregularity. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 358—360.

The Fourth General Council.

The council of Chalcedon was called by the Emperor Marcian, A. D. 451, and was attended by six hundred bishops, mostly from the East. This council, among other things, decreed that "following the holy fathers of Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, we unitedly declare that one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is to be acknowledged as being perfect in his Godhead

and perfect in his humanity, truly God and truly man; with a rational soul, and a body of like substance with the Father as to his divine nature, of like substance with us as to his human nature; in all things like us, sin excepted; begotten of the Father from all eternity, as to his divine nature, of Mary the mother of God, in these last days, for us and for our salvation, as to his human nature; recognized as our Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, in two natures unconfounded, unchanged, undivided, inseparable; the distinction of natures not at all done away by the union, but rather the peculiarity of each nature preserved and combined into one substance, not separated or divided into two persons, but one Son, only-begotten, God the word, the Lord Jesus Christ. As the prophets before taught concerning him, so he, the Lord Jesus Christ, hath taught us, and the creed of the fathers hath transmitted to us."

In this council, which had been called at his request, the influence of the bishop of Rome was predominant. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 410, 411.

The Fifth General Council.

This was assembled at Constantinople, by Justinian, A. D. 553. It consisted of one hundred and sixty-five bishops, principally from the East. This council inserted the name of Origen in its list of heretics, and condemned certain tenets known as the *three chapters;* but did nothing of importance. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 411.

CHAPTER IV.

MONACHISM.

Monachism originated in Egypt, and was adopted from a previous sect of religious enthusiasts that arose under Judaism. — Murdock's Mosheim, pages 37, 38.

The subjects of this enthusiasm were called monks, from μοναχος, one that lives alone. They were also called ascetics, from the severities to which they submitted. The monks were originally of two classes. 1. The Eremites, who lived in deserts and in perfect solitude. 2. The Coenobites, who lived in families. The heads of these families were called abbots; an Egyptian word, signifying fathers. Still more severe than the discipline of the ordinary eremites was that of the anchorets, who lived without shelter, and without any fixed residence. They were called anchorets from αναχωρεω, as persons who retired from the world.

In the third century the number of monks was small, and they were mostly confined to Egypt. In the fourth century they became numerous, and began to be organized into regular societies. A single monastic colony, A. D. 348, at Tabenua, in Egypt, amounted to fifty thousand. In the fifth century the system of monasteries was introduced generally throughout the Christian world. But hitherto vows of perpetual celibacy, poverty and obedience, had not been adopted by these orders. All their austerities were submitted to voluntarily, during their pleasure, and abandoned at will. Till the fourth century the monks were all laymen, under the care of the bishops. In the fourth century they began to be admitted to the rank of clergymen. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 267, 328, 329.

Celibacy of the Clergy.

In the first centuries marriage was permitted to the clergy, equally with others; but in the third century it was thought that married persons were more exposed to the assaults of evil spirits than others, and, from this time, marriage began to be discouraged among the clergy. The council of Nice deliberated respecting the question of the expediency of imposing celibacy on all the clergy; but did not adopt it, through the opposition of Paphnutius, an eminent unmarried bishop. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 166.

Female Monachism.

Monachism began with men, but soon extended to women, who entered into it with similar views, and assumed the title of nuns. The word nun is of Egyptian origin, an signifies *pure*. The nuns were the pure, or puritans. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 266, 267.

The bishops of Rome and Constantinople having become, by a gradual series of usurpation, the two great Christian patriarchs, and spiritual princes of the world, each became desirous to obtain the preëminence. A council called by Maurice, A. D. 587, composed of patriarchs, Roman senators and metropolitans, conceded to the bishop of Constantinople, John the Fastor, the title of universal bishop. This was strenuously opposed by the bishop of Rome, who contended that it was profane and anti-christian, and not to be tolerated. But, in 606, the Roman bishop, Boniface III., prevailed on the abominable tyrant Phocas, who had ascended the imperial throne by the murder of the Emperor Maurice, to divest the bishop of Constantinople of the title of universal bishop, and confer it upon himself. From this time, 606, the claim of universal jurisdiction over the Christian world has been steadily persisted in by the bishops of Rome; and this is generally reckoned by Protestants as being the date of the complete establishment of the Papacy.

The bishops of Rome were styled bishops, equally with other bishops, till 604. The title of Pope or Papa, Father, was not exclusively conceded to them, and the use of it by other bishops was not forbidden, till the time of Gregory VII., A. D. 1075. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 436, 437. Elements of Universal History, by H. White, Trinity College, Cambridge, p. 199.

As Monachism was considered the perfection of Christianity, its professors, in the process of time, were numerously called to the office of bishops and inferior clergy, till, at the end of the fourth century, monastic life was considered an almost necessary preparation for the clerical office, especially for its

highest order of bishops. This gradually led to the introduction of Monachism as an essential requisite for the clerical profession. An attempt to impose this obligation on the clergy had been defeated at the Council of Nice; but it was again resumed, and celibacy prescribed first by Cyricius, bishop of Rome, A. D. 385, and after this by several Western councils.

In the East this law of general clerical celibacy was rejected; although it was, in the course of time, imposed on the higher clergy.

Mary, and other saints, were not worshipped till after the fourth century. In the fifth century images of Mary began to be placed in the temples, and she began to receive a degree of homage approaching to divine worship. This was increased in the sixth century, and carried to the greatest pitch of extravagance. Litanies had been originally addressed to God alone, but they were now addressed to Mary and other saints. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 414.

The monks were originally subject to the authority of the bishops within whose provinces they lived; but, in the seventh century, they became subject to the Pope. They were extremely numerous, and abounded with lunatics, fanatics and profligates. St. Benedict introduced important changes in the system of monkery in 529, one of which was to bind them permanently by the rules of his order. Previously they had changed their rules at pleasure, or even abandoned them entirely. Their principal vows were three; poverty, chastity and obedience. After the time of Benedict these became generally irrevocable. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 392—395.

CHAPTER V.

PROGRESS OF THE HIERARCHY.

The early bishops were parish bishops. They were the pastors of single churches, and presided over single congregations only. Subsequently a great change was effected. Some bishops rose above others. Single communities grew, in many cases, into an aggregation of communities, and formed a diocese, or spiritual province; the metropolitan rose above the common bishop, and the patriarch above the metropolitan, till, in the West, the bishop of Rome attained the primacy; and, in the East, the bishop of Constantinople far exceeded all the other Eastern bishops.

In the larger cities the Christian churches, which began with single congregations, grew, till in many cases they constituted several congregations. These continued to be under one bishop, or *general pastor*, with separate presbyters, or particular pastors. At Rome, in the beginning of the fourth century, there were forty churches under the bishop of that city.

Besides becoming multiplied in the cities, the churches extended into the country adjacent, and formed a kind of colonial country churches, subject to the city bishop equally with the city churches. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 231—236.

Metropolitan bishops presided over a certain number of inferior bishops, and called and moderated the provincial councils.

Above the metropolitans were the patriarchs, or heads of divisions consisting of several provinces. The principal of these were the bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Rome, and, at a later period, of Constantinople.

The bishop of Rome, at the commencement of the fourth

century, presided over forty churches within the city, besides numerous churches in the country adjacent. His clerical establishment at this time embraced the following list of officers:

1. Presbyters, 46. 2. Deacons, 7. 3. Sub-deacons, 7. 4. Acolyths, 42. 5. Exorcists, 52. 6. Readers, door-keepers, &c.

His revenues for charitable purposes supported fifteen hundred widows and poor. — Presbyterian Quarterly Review, vol. III., No. 1, 1854.

At this time the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome did not extend beyond his city and the adjacent district.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, A. D. 248—258, writes to the bishop of Rome as only an equal, not as his master or superior.

The sub-deacon collected charitable contributions; the reader had custody of the sacred books, and read them publicly; the acolyth attended on the bishop, and carried a lamp before him; the exorcist exorcised evil spirits from epileptics and from the candidates for baptism; and the door-keeper excluded improper persons from the church, &c.

Tonsure began in the fourth century, the mitre was introduced in the eighth, and the tiara in the tenth.

The fourth council of Carthage, A. D. 398, forbade the clergy to wear long hair or a long beard, or to study beauty of dress. It allowed him to work as an artisan or agriculturist.

The excommunications of the ancient churches were of two kinds:

1. Simple exclusion from membership, with liberty to attend public worship.

2. Exclusion both from membership and from public worship, and from all Christian society.

The Christian emperors were the virtual heads of the church throughout the Roman empire, and were tacitly recognized as such. The imperial rescripts made heresy a civil offence, by affixing civil penalties to it. The laws of Theodosius made it a capital offence in respect to a small section of the Maniche-

ans, and thus led the way to those sanguinary persecutions which followed.

The Roman calendar set apart nearly one hundred days for heathen festivals. They also had various public spectacles designed for the amusement of the people.

1. The gymnastic games.
2. Theatrical exhibitions.
3. Gladiatorial exhibitions.
4. Circuses.

Christianity opposed all these, and broke most of them up, entirely.

It also abrogated the ancient system of slavery. It did this gradually:

1. Ameliorating the slave system, by taking from the master the power of life and death, with respect to his slaves.
2. Prohibiting the separation of families.
3. Encouraging emancipation, and authorizing it in the presence of the churches, and with their approbation.

Constantine the Great enacted a law allowing churches to receive bequests and hold lands. From this time bequests and gifts to the church became frequent, and almost constant; and, before a century had passed away, so much property had passed into the possession of the church, that a more restrictive policy was adopted. Some of the estates of the heathen temples were confiscated to the church; but these were more generally given to the sovereign.

In most churches there was a triple division of the proceeds of church property; one third going to the bishop, one third to the clergy, and the other third to the church edifice and the poor. The bishops gradually became the managers of this property, and appropriated it at their discretion. By a gradual assumption of power, they became a separate community, perpetuating itself independently of the church.

The history of the Christian church during the five hundred years from the close of the first century to the close of the sixth,

cannot fail to impress every ingenuous mind with regret and sorrow. How did its pure light become darkened! How did its glory pass away!

Originally a vast number of independent democracies, it had now become consolidated into a few great despotisms; originally devoted to the love and worship of God, and the practice of virtue, it was now overrun with superstition, and had become the great arena for pride, arrogance and ambition; originally a holy church, comparatively without blemish, now the whole head is sick, the whole heart faint, and nearly all hands are defiled.

It will naturally be asked, how could this mighty defection happen? If the church ever had a better constitution and a better character, how could they have been so lost?

I answer, they were lost by degrees, by little and little; just as all virtue is lost in the individual, just as all gradual revolutions are brought about in the state. The first step of decline was comparatively small; but one step led to another, and that to others still, till the most perfect freedom was exchanged for the most perfect despotism, and the most exemplary holiness for the most abominable wickedness.

Constantine allowed the bishops to act as judges in ecclesiastical affairs, and in secular matters submitted, by the parties interested, to their decisions.

The Jews had always been accustomed, in all nations, to settle controversies among themselves, by judges and arbitrators of their own.

The same plan was adopted by Christians, and was conformable to the policy of the Roman law. Under Constantine, the decisions of the bishops, respecting temporal matters submitted to them, were allowed to have the same force as those of the civil courts. We find a law in the imperial code, 408 A. D., that the decision of the bishops shall be final to all who choose to be tried by the priests. A similar privilege was granted to the Jewish patriarchs, in 398.

The churches began early to receive real estates, the proceeds of which were designed to be used for religious purposes. In process of time these became numerous and important. The Christian emperors, in many cases, made large donations of this kind. The control of these estates devolved on the bishops, and increased their influence; as wealth is always a means of power.

Having first exalted a portion of the ministry to the position of bishops of dioceses, it was natural to proceed in the same direction to exalt some still higher, to be the heads of provinces and patriarchates. These were called *Ἐξαρχοι*, exarchs, *Ἀρχιεπισκοποι*, archbishops, and *Πατριαρχαι*, patriarchs. The title of archbishop is still retained in the Papal church, and the church of England; and that of patriarch in the Greek and other Eastern churches. The division of the church into archepiscopal provinces proceeded on the same principle as its division into dioceses.

The great patriarchs of the East were the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch. Several others enjoyed the same distinction as these for a time, particularly those of Ephesus, Cesarea and Jerusalem. The patriarchs were at first of equal rank, no one claiming jurisdiction over the others, and each being restricted to his own province.

The council of Chalcedon, however, in 451, allowed an appeal from the other Eastern patriarchs, to the patriarch of Constantinople, thus giving him the supremacy throughout the East. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., p. 366.

While there were several great patriarchs in the East, the bishop of Rome was the sole great patriarch in the West. His position at the seat of empire, in respect to state affairs, and at the head of the richest, largest and best-informed church in the West, perhaps in the world, gave him great consequence, and great facilities for the attainment of power, all of which were carefully improved. During this period it came to be generally supposed that the bishop of Rome was the successor of the apostle Peter.

This successorship to Peter was not claimed at first to have given them any superior authority over the other successors of the apostles. It gave them, however, an honorable distinction.

The claim to peculiar authority, as the successor to Peter, is first set forth by Leo the Great, bishop of Rome from 440 to 461. A decree was obtained by him from the Emperor Valentinian III., A. D. 445, by which the bishop of Rome was made head of the whole Western church. He now became unwilling to admit the bishop of Constantinople as his equal.

The pretended Roman episcopate of Peter has been so much insisted upon in later times, and his supposed martyrdom at Rome has been so generally received, that I have thought it proper to examine that in a previous chapter.

From the time of Justinian, the bishops were intrusted with civil jurisdiction over their clergy, and over monks and nuns. They were also empowered to interfere at their discretion in behalf of all prisoners, minors, insane persons and oppressed women. From Heraclius, 610—664, the patriarchs received jurisdiction over their clergy and monks, in criminal cases.

In 502, all participation of the laity in the management of the church of Rome was prohibited.

John, bishop of Constantinople, assumed the title of universal bishop, in 587. This title is still retained in the Greek church, by the bishop of Constantinople.

Phocas, the murderer of Maurice, ascended the throne of the Greek empire A. D. 602. He took part with the bishop of Rome against the bishop of Constantinople, and proclaimed him the primate of Christendom, A. D. 606.

This is considered by many as perfecting the system of the Papacy, and making the Western apostasy complete. All before this was the transition stage from the simplicity and purity of earlier times. Rites and ceremonies were greatly multiplied, and the services of religion were performed with great pomp. But the spirit of the apostles and early fathers was gone. Mohammedanism was first proposed A. D. 609; the Hegira, or flight

of Mohammed to Yatrib, was in A. D. 622, when the conquests of Mohammedanism commenced; so that the two great spiritual despotisms of the Papacy and of Mohammedanism were perfected nearly together.

The influence of the emperors and other sovereigns, where Christianity prevailed, in regulating the affairs of the church, began with Constantine. His first direct interference in church affairs was in receiving an appeal of Donatus from the church courts in Africa, in 313.

Constantine intrusted the matter,

1. To the bishop of Rome and his provincial synod, A. D. 313; and,

2. To a special council at Arelate, A. D. 314.

In both instances, the decisions were against Donatus; whereupon the emperor passed severe laws against him and his adherents.

By the general consent of the church, the judgment of the emperor was the last resort, and his supreme authority generally acquiesced in; and the imperial laws with respect to church matters were received by the bishops and others with implicit obedience.

The emperor had great influence in directing the election of the most important bishops, and sometimes appointed and deposed bishops himself, at pleasure. The exact relations of the church and state, however, were not distinctly defined.

During this interval from A. D. 100—606, many important changes took place in the constitution, objects and administration, of the church.

1. The establishment of diocesan episcopacy, with diocesan bishops, archbishops and patriarchs, as heads of provinces, and the universal bishops of Constantinople and Rome.

2. The prohibition of marriage to the clergy.

3. The exclusion of the people from all participation in church courts.

4. The establishment of religious orders of monks and nuns,

under vows of perpetual celibacy, poverty, obedience to superiors, and seclusion from the world.

5. The adoption of a clerical costume by the clergy, 581 A. D. The mitre, however, was not adopted till the eighth century, and the tiara in the ninth. The council of Carthage in 398 prohibited clergymen from wearing long hair or beards, and required them to dress plain. It also allowed them to work as mechanics and agriculturists, provided they did not neglect their spiritual duties as pastors of their churches.

6. The adoption of liturgies. Liturgies first began to be used in public worship in the third century. In the fourth century each bishop prescribed a liturgy for his diocese, and a great variety of liturgical services were introduced.

7. The adoption of the crozier as a badge of office. The crozier, or bishop's staff, was adopted from the Roman augurs in the fourth century. Some make it correspond to the sceptres of kings, and others to the shepherd's crook or staff. It is used as an emblem of authority. The pallium, or sacred mantle, began to be bestowed by the Pope on superior bishops, as a mark of preëminent dignity, A. D. 606.

The post-apostolic church retained a good degree of its primitive purity and power, till its general triumph over paganism, under Constantine and his successors. From this time its decline was rapid.

In the conquest of paganism a great battle was fought, and gained; but, by the introduction of spiritual despotism, with its attendant corruptions, the benefits of that great victory were nearly lost.

The church might have been the salvation of the Roman empire. Had it retained its primitive purity, it would have changed the fortunes, not of the Roman empire only, but of the world, and have led the human race directly to the blessings of general liberty, and an advanced Christian civilization. The boundless disorders, confusion and miseries, attendant on the final overthrow of the Roman empire, and the general triumph of bar-

barism in Europe, are to be set down, in a large part, to the corrupt and time-serving Christianity of that period; and similar corruptions must, at all times, be attended with corresponding evils. Pure religion and undefiled is not only the eternal salvation of its subjects; it is the salvation and indefinite preservation of states and empires.

The great changes made in the constitution and government of the church, after the times of the apostles, is not a matter of doubt or debate among any class of candid and intelligent historians, or readers of history. It is undeniable, and is admitted equally by Catholics and Protestants. Mosheim, McLane, Murdock, Milman, Gieseler, Brigham, Milner, and as many as have written on these subjects, all bear testimony to the gradual rise of the Papacy, and the continual modification of the institutions and usages of the church, during the first five hundred years after the apostles. This is admitted by intelligent and well-informed Catholics. It cannot be denied.

But the question is, whether it was a legitimate development, and whether the church was made more perfect by these organic changes in its constitution, or whether it was a corruption.

A tree is known by its fruits. Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. If the post-apostolic church bears better fruits than the church of the apostles, it may be presumed to be a development. If, when God looked that it should bring forth grapes, it brought forth wild grapes, it was a corruption.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LIGHTS OF THE POST-APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

This church was adorned with some illustrious characters. The most distinguished of these were Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose.

Origen.

Origen was an Alexandrian, born of Christian parents, A. D. 185. His father, Leonidas, was a devout man, and took great pains with the education of his son. He suffered martyrdom A. D. 202, when Origen was seventeen years old. The property of the family was confiscated, and the mother and seven sons were left to poverty.

In A. D. 203, Origen was made master of the catechetic school of Alexandria. He practised great austerity, and lived on coarse fare. Interpreting Matt. 19: 12 literally, he emasculated himself, to remove all temptation to incontinence. In 228 he was made a presbyter by the bishops of Jerusalem and Cesarea, greatly to the offence of Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria. Demetrius objected to his ordination on two grounds: 1. That he was a eunuch; 2. That he did not belong to the jurisdiction of these bishops, but to his own jurisdiction.

In A. D. 231, Origen commenced writing at Cesarea. He was one of the most accomplished scholars of his time, and a man of great eloquence, and indefatigable industry in laboring for the advancement of religion. He died at Tyre, A. D. 254, aged 69.

He was generally accounted orthodox, but departed, in many respects, from the generally-received opinions of the times, and fell into several great errors. The principal of his errors relate

to the preëxistence of human souls, the final recovery and salvation of all men and devils, and the three-fold method of interpreting the Scriptures. He was one of the most voluminous writers of antiquity, and wrote extensively on the Bible. He was the author of the allegorical mode of interpretation, which has been adopted in modern times by Swedenborg and his followers. He numbered among his pupils the most eminent martyrs and divines of the age in which he lived.

Cyprian.

Cyprian was bishop of Carthage from 248 to 258, when he suffered martyrdom. His conversion was two years before his elevation to the episcopacy. He was a most earnest and laborious bishop, and a man of considerable abilities. His character was that of an orator and man of business, rather than that of a scholar. He had high ideas of the episcopacy, and contributed to increase its credit and authority.

Athanasius.

Athanasius was born at Alexandria, A. D. 298. After being well educated, he was made a deacon, A. D. 319; accompanied Alexander, his bishop, to the council of Nice, in 325; succeeded him in the church of Alexandria, at his death, in 326, at the age of twenty-seven; and, for forty-six years, was the head of the orthodox party against the Arians. His great zeal against the Arians involved him in numerous theological conflicts, and exposed him to frequent persecutions, and great hardships and sufferings. He died A. D. 373. His works are numerous, and chiefly controversial.

Chrysostom.

Chrysostom, the golden mouth, was born A. D. 343, at Antioch. At the age of twenty he embraced the monastic life. At thirty-one he was ordained a presbyter; in 398 he was made patriarch of Constantinople; and in 404 he was, after much trouble from the

opposition which he encountered, finally banished to Cucusus, in Armenia. Going from this place to Colchis, he died, A. D. 407, aged fifty-two. His eloquence was overpowering, but his preaching was excessively pungent and severe, and gave offence on account of its severity. His works are numerous and valuable.

Jerome.

Jerome of Stridon has been referred to on pages 59 and 60, and his character and labors briefly described. He towered considerably above the ordinary men of his time, or of any time, in respect to learning, and zeal for the interests of religion and of the human race, according to his understanding of those interests, and in his indefatigable labors for their promotion. Christianity glories in the energy and force of his character, and the general uprightness of his intentions. It is also humbled in view of his errors and imperfections, as it is in view of the errors and imperfections of many other great lights of the post-apostolic period. He was at the same time a great man, a good man, a learned man, a devout man; and, on the other hand, the subject of dark superstition with respect to Monachism, and of unchristian asperity and violence in debate. He exhibits, as most of the fathers of this period do, both the virtues and the errors of his times. Religion was already shorn of its glory, and the clouds of superstition were settling thick and heavy around it. Monachism was the rage and mania of the times, and a powerful instrument of general corruption. Yet it was prosecuted with the best intentions, and the most heroic devotion to the promotion of the glory of God, and the happiness of the human race.

Much as the post-apostolic fathers rise above the level of ordinary unsanctified humanity in their heroic virtues, they fall far below the serene majesty and purity of their divine lord, and of his holy apostles, in the perfection and symmetry of their characters. They are invaluable instructors and guides, if we read their writings and contemplate their lives with due dis-

crimination. But, if we exalt them unduly, and take their opinions and practice as in perfect conformity to reason and duty, and a perfect illustration of the Gospel of Christ, we shall be greatly misled. A disposition to do this has been the calamity of many ingenuous minds, and the occasion of great harm.

Augustine.

Augustine, bishop of Hippo, was born at Tageste, in Numidia, Africa, A. D. 354. His father was a pagan till near the close of life; and his mother an eminent Christian, by the name of Monia. He was well educated, and became a teacher of rhetoric, first in his native town, and then at Carthage, in 380, at the age of twenty-six. He was a fine scholar and popular teacher, but of loose principles and dissolute habits. In 383 he went to Rome, and in 384 to Milan, where he was converted by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, whose discourses were able and powerful, and attracted much attention at that time; and was baptized in 387. He subsequently went to Carthage, sold his estates, which were considerable, and devoted the avails to charitable purposes. He lived three years as a recluse, and in 395 was made colleague bishop of Hippo, in Africa. He continued in the office of bishop of Hippo, till his death, in A. D. 430, at the age of seventy-six.

He was a man of great genius and industry, and the master thinker of his age. He first proposed the system of doctrines, respecting divine sovereignty, which were adopted by Calvin, and which constitute the distinguishing feature of Calvinistic theology. Calvin was a disciple of Augustine. Both were men of eminent piety and learning, and of the highest order of ability; and both contributed powerfully to give direction to the human mind in after ages. Their influence is still felt, and will be felt while time shall last.

Ambrose.

Ambrose was the son of a prætorian prefect of the same name,

who was governor-general of Gaul-Britain and Spain; and, after receiving a good education, and holding some responsible positions, being called, in virtue of his civil office, at Milan, to interfere to quell a riot in the church, he was chosen bishop of that church in 374, and retained that office till his death in 397, at the age of sixty-four. He was a man of great energy and dignity of character, and a zealous and faithful bishop. He was a man of some learning; but his writings are of no great value. His great firmness was evinced in his debarring the emperor Theodosius the Great from the communion of the Lord's supper, on account of his slaughter of the Christians of Thessalonica. He did good service to the cause of Christ in his day; but helped on, as most others did, the general prevalence of superstition and spiritual despotism.

Each century had its great lights and ornaments.

The second century had Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. The third century had Origen, Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian, Dionysius of Rome, and Alexander of Jerusalem. The fourth century had Eusebius Pamphili, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Lactantius, Ambrose, Jerome of Stridon, and Augustine. The fifth century had Cyril and Theodoret, and the sixth century had Benedict and Gregory of Rome. Eusebius, the friend of Pamphilus, was the great ecclesiastical historian of his times. His works are invaluable.

For a more full account of the post-apostolic fathers, the reader is referred to the works of the ancient fathers, and to Murdock's Mosheim, Neander, Gieseler, the Encyclopedias, Milman's History of Ancient Christianity, Milner, and Bunsen's Hippolytus, &c.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONTROVERSIES OF THE POST-APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

THE principal controversies of the post-apostolic church were against Gnosticism, Manicheanism, Montanism, Arianism, Donatism, Nestorianism and Pelagianism.

Gnosticism.

Gnosticism was of Eastern origin. It held to the doctrine of a world consisting of pure emanations from God, and regarded these emanation-beings as the angel-princes of nations. The Gnostics generally admitted an inferior emanation-God of this world, but differed concerning his character; some regarding him benevolent, and others malevolent. The believers in a benevolent emanation-God of this world loved and honored him, and those in a malevolent one hated and feared him, and considered matter his creation, essentially evil, to be got rid of as far as possible. — Neander's History of the Church, vol. I., pp. 366—396.

The Gnostics rejected the law of Moses, and regarded Christ as an emanation-God. — White's Ancient History, p. 156.

Manicheanism.

Manicheanism is a refinement on Gnosticism. It supposes two eternal principles; one essentially good, which is God; the other essentially evil. These are the sources of two kingdoms: first, that emanating from God, and being in agreement with him; secondly, that emanating from the evil principle. God's kingdom is one of order, light, love and happiness; the opposing kingdom is one of disorder, darkness, malice and misery. The two meet in this world, and are at war with each other; and not

only so, but meet in individual members of the human race and contend for the mastery. — Neander's History of the Church, vol. I., pp. 478—506.

The Manicheans believed the God of the Old Testament and the evil spirit to be the same, and held to a triple division of souls. — White's Ancient History, p. 156.

Montanism.

Montanism originated with Montanus, who was a religious enthusiast of the second century. It recognized the Holy Spirit, under the title of the Paraclete, as a continual spirit of inspiration in the church; and the bishops as his special organs. Its church was a church of the spirit. It attached great importance to religious sentimentalism, and is characterized by Neander as essentially a system of pietism.

It was more or less diffused through the church in the second century, and controversies respecting it were conducted with great violence. The Montanists claimed to be the only true Christians. — Neander's History of the Church, vol. I., pp. 506—526.

Arianism.

Arianism arose in the fourth century, and was first proposed by Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, from whom the system takes its name. It consists essentially in holding that Jesus Christ is not the equal of the Father, but a creature of a super-angelic order. The Arian views attracted general attention, and gained numerous adherents. At some periods they had the predominance, through the influence of Roman emperors who favored them; but they were condemned by the council of Nice, and other general councils, and finally vanquished. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 287—305.

Donatism.

The Donatists, so called from Donatus, the founder of their sect, arose in Africa, in the fourth century. This sect was

founded on the principle of discipline, and required great strictness and severity.

It created great divisions, and was the subject of the deliberations of numerous councils, and the occasion of sanguinary persecution. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 283—286.

Nestorianism.

Nestorianism, so called from Nestorius, its founder, arose in the fifth century. It consisted in the denial that Mary was θεοτοκος, mother of God; and the assertion that Christ has two natures, the divine and human, perfectly distinct in one person. This doctrine, at first condemned, became subsequently the general doctrine both of the Eastern and Western churches. It conquered the conqueror. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 356—370.

Pelagianism.

Pelagianism, so called from Pelagius, its author, denied natural depravity, and the imputation of Adam's sin, and asserted human ability for the practice of holiness. These views attracted much attention, and were generally discussed and condemned in the church courts.

But, under some modifications, they have always had considerable prevalence in the Catholic church; and the great systems of Calvinism and Arminianism bear strong family resemblances to those of Augustine and Pelagius in the fifth century. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 370—378.

Besides the above, the greatest conflict of all maintained by the post-apostolic church was that against Paganism, and the Greek and Roman systems of superstition and demonology, in which it was completely successful. This conflict is described, in Rev. 12: 7—11, under the symbolical imagery of war in heaven; when Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven.

CHAPTER VIII.

A COMPARISON OF THE APOSTOLIC AND POST-APOSTOLIC CHURCHES.

1. The apostolic bishop was a parochial bishop, the pastor of a single church. The post-apostolic bishop came, in the process of time, to be a prelatical or diocesan bishop, the bishop of a diocese.

2. The apostolic church had no patriarchs, or superior metropolitan bishops. The post-apostolic church had the patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and of several other archepiscopal sees.

3. The apostolic churches were independent of each other. The post-apostolic churches were subjected to the common government of the hierarchy, and united together under a system of centralization and dependence.

4. The apostolic church councils were congregational and democratic; the people participating in them with their pastors. The post-apostolic councils consisted of bishops only, and were provincial and general.

5. The apostolic presbyters were the same as the bishops. The post-apostolic presbyters were an inferior order of clergy, under the government of the bishops.

6. The apostolic church was independent of the state. The post-apostolic churches admitted the supreme authority of the emperors in many church matters.

7. The apostolic churches had no system of Monachism. The post-apostolic churches established numerous orders of monks and nuns, and, to a great extent, interdicted marriage to the clergy.

8. The apostolic church worshipped God alone. The post-apostolic churches adopted the worship of saints and martyrs.

9. The apostolic churches adhered to the sacred Scriptures as their supreme law. The post-apostolic churches nullified the Scriptures by lying traditions and the decisions of councils.

The changes that occurred in the church after the apostles are a remarkable instance of progression. Parochial episcopacy grew into diocesan episcopacy; diocesan episcopacy, into patriarchy, or archepiscopacy; and patriarchy, into Popery, or supreme patriarchy. All were church despotisms.

Which of these systems is entitled to be followed and copied in our times? Shall we follow the apostles, and adopt their polity? Or shall we follow the post-apostolic fathers, and adopt their polity? We cannot follow both.

PART III.

THE PATRIARCHAL AND PAPAL CHURCHES.

DIVISION I.

THE PATRIARCHAL CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

The Greek church comprehends those Christians in the East who are governed by patriarchs, whose patriarchs are the successors of the ancient patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Constantinople was consecrated by Constantine in 330, on the site of the ancient Byzantium, to be the new Rome, and capital of his empire. It was, from that time till 1453, the residence of the Eastern emperors, and has since been the capital of the Turkish empire. The city has had various fortunes. It has been besieged twenty-four times, and taken six times.

The second general council, convoked at Constantinople by Theodosius the Great, in A. D. 381, besides condemning the doctrines of the Arians, elevated the bishop of Constantinople to a rank next to the bishop of Rome, and committed the disputes of the inferior bishops to the decision of the emperor.

The fourth general council, held at Chalcedon under Marcian, declared in favor of the two natures in Christ, the divine and human, and against the Monophysites, who held to a single complex nature, both human and divine conjoined, and gave to the bishop of Constantinople equal rights and privileges with the bishop of Rome, but allowed the latter precedence of rank.

In 482 the Eastern churches gave in their adhesion to a formula of concord, called the Henoticon, authorized by the Greek Emperor Zeno. In consequence of this, Felix II., bishop of Rome, pronounced a sentence of excommunication against the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, who had been leaders in forming the Henoticon and procuring its adoption by their clergy. A reünion took place in A. D. 519, which continued till 733, when the bishop of Rome published a sentence of excommunication against the Iconoclasts, or image-breakers, in the Greek churches; and in 862 a similar judgment was proclaimed against Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople.

The preservation of the union of the Eastern and Western churches was rendered more difficult than it had formerly been, by the breaking up of the Roman empire, and the formation of new and independent kingdoms in the West.

Photius charges the bishop of Rome with arrogating to himself powers that did not belong to him; with altering the usages of the ancient churches, in forbidding priests to marry, and in several other things, and especially in claiming authority over himself, who was his equal.

The separation was made still wider in 1054, when Michael Cerularius, the patriarch of Constantinople, charged the Latins with heresy on several accounts; in consequence of which, Pope Leo IX. excommunicated him, with superadded insult and abuse.

From this time, 1054, the separation of the Greek and Latin churches has been complete, though unions have several times been proposed by both parties.

The Greek church deviated less from the usages of the seventh century, in later times, than the Roman Catholics.

At the overthrow of the Greek empire, in 1453, the Greek Christians passed under the dominion of the Turks. The Russians were compelled to adopt the creed of the Greek church by Prince Wladimir, in A. D. 988.

The heads of the Greek church are the patriarch of Constantinople and the emperor of Russia. The patriarchate of Constantinople embraces the older patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, as subordinate provinces. Candidates for these patriarchates are proposed by the patriarch of Constantinople; nor is anything of importance attempted without his permission.

The patriarch of Alexandria resides at Cairo, and presides over the church in Egypt, Nubia, Lybia and part of Arabia.

The patriarch of Antioch resides at Damascus, and presides over the church in Syria and the adjacent country.

The patriarch of Jerusalem resides at Jerusalem, and presides over the church in Palestine, and parts of Syria and Arabia.

The Eastern patriarchs preside over a poverty-stricken people, and are not themselves supported in any considerable grandeur.

The patriarch of Constantinople is elected by twelve bishops nearest the city of Constantinople, and is confirmed by the Sultan. He summons councils, and by them decides and regulates all ecclesiastical affairs; and, by permission of the Sultan, holds civil courts and tries civil causes among his subjects. His support is derived from contributions imposed on the churches under his government, and is variable.

The Greek church acknowledges the authority of the sacred Scriptures, and the first six general councils. But no private person is allowed to depart, in his expositions of the Scriptures, from the patriarch and higher clergy.

The Greek church is indebted for its present confession of faith to the Russian Greek church. This confession was composed by a Russian Greek bishop, in A. D. 1642, and adopted by the patriarch of Constantinople and his subordinate patriarchs, and also by the independent patriarch of Moscow, in A. D. 1643.

It is entitled the orthodox confession of the catholic and apostolic church of Christ.

Like the Roman Catholic, the Greek church recognizes two sources of Christian doctrine, the Bible, and tradition. It holds in great respect the fathers of the Greek church, especially John of Damascus, who flourished A. D. 728, and the first six general councils. It does not allow the patriarchs or synods to introduce new doctrines, and teaches, like the Roman Catholics, that faith in its doctrines is necessary to salvation. It holds that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only; and has, like the Catholics, seven sacraments: 1, baptism; 2, confirmation; 3, the eucharist; 4, penance; 5, ordination; 6, marriage; 7, extreme unction.

It baptizes by immersing the subject three times, and baptizes infants. Its triune immersions are in honor of the divine trinity.

It holds the doctrine of transubstantiation, the same as the Catholics; but uses leavened bread, and wine mixed with water. It distributes the elements in both kinds, and to children equally with adults.

The ordinary clergy are allowed to marry a virgin, but not a widow; and are not allowed to contract second marriages. Widowed clergy are not permitted to retain livings, but go into cloisters.

The higher clergy are not allowed to marry. Marriages among the laity are not regarded as indissoluble, and divorces are frequent. It rejects the doctrine of purgatory, works of supererogation, indulgences, and dispensations; and recognizes no visible vicar of Christ on earth.

The Eastern Christians practise the invocation of saints, the same as the Catholics. They fast Wednesday and Friday of every week, besides having four great annual fasts: 1, forty days before Easter, in commemoration of the temptation and fast of Christ; 2, from the 1st to the 15th of August, for the virgin Mary; 3, from the 15th to the 26th of November, for the

apostle Philip; 4, the supposed day of the beheading of John the Baptist.

There is but little preaching in the Greek church. The patriarch of Constantinople holds a holy synod at Constantinople, composed of his three subordinate patriarchs, a number of metropolitans and bishops, and twelve principal secular Greeks. The Greek church has the monastic system, nearly the same as the Roman Catholics.

The Russians formerly received their prelates from the patriarch of Constantinople, and were dependent on that patriarchate; but, in 1589, Jeremiah, patriarch of Constantinople, in a council assembled at Moscow, was obliged to establish Russia as a patriarchate nearly independent. This concession was confirmed, in 1593, in a council at Constantinople; and about 1650 the independence of the Russian patriarch was made complete.

In 1721 the church government in Russia was assumed by Peter the Great, who declared himself its patriarch, and who assumed the administration of its government, with the assistance of a college of bishops and secular clergy, called the holy synod, held first at Moscow, and now at St. Petersburg. Under this synod there are now reported four metropolitans, eleven archbishops, nineteen bishops, twelve thousand and five hundred parish churches, and four hundred and twenty-five convents, fifty-eight of which have monastic schools for the education of the clergy, with a small annual appropriation from the state.

The Greek church in the kingdom of Greece is a branch broken off from that of Turkey, and administered on the same principles. Its utter destitution of moral rectitude has been singularly exhibited in its persecution of Dr. J. King, American missionary at Athens; and is the reproach of Christendom.

CHAPTER II.

THE NESTORIAN OR SYRIAN CHURCH.

These are denominated Nestorians from Nestorius, and Syrian Christians from their Syrian origin, and the use of the ancient Syriac language in their religious service.

In 431, Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, was condemned and deposed, in a council at Ephesus, for teaching that Christ had two natures, and denying that Mary was θεοτκος, *mother of God*, though he admitted that she was Χριστοτοκος, *mother of Christ*. Nestorius was first confined in a monastery near Antioch, and then banished to the deserts of Egypt, where he died.

Many of his adherents were the subjects of persecution and banishment. Some of them went to Persia, and succeeded in building up a powerful national church there, which was subsequently extended to other parts of the East. The other Christians in Persia joined them in 499. In the eleventh century, they converted the Tartar tribe whose Christian ruler is known in history under the title of *Prester John*. His people long remained attached to Christianity.

The Nestorians are the oldest sect that has survived the ravages of time; and many of its earliest churches were in the lineal succession from the apostles, equally with those of the Greek and Roman communions. In their better days their numbers and wealth were vastly greater than at present; and they carried the Gospel, and planted the standard of the cross, throughout the whole region of Central Asia, to China. They differ from the Jacobites, who are Syrian Monophysites; who are quite numerous in that region, and are derived from the same Syrian stock.

But while the Nestorians hold to the doctrine of two spiritual natures in Christ, the divine and human, the Jacobites hold the Eutychian doctrine of but one, in which the divine and human are blended. In this respect the Jacobites agree with the Armenians. The Nestorians also differ from the Chaldeans, a name given by the Roman Catholics to its converts from the Nestorian community; and who may not improperly be called Papal Nestorians, or Papal Syrians.

The modern Nestorians are principally confined to Koordistan, in Turkey, and Oroomiah, in Persia, embracing the ancient Assyria and part of Media. Its western portions are in Turkey, and its eastern in Persia. The Koords are principally Mohammedans, and many of them in a state of barbarism. The Mountain Nestorians inhabit the wildest and most inaccessible part of the Koordish mountains, and obtain their subsistence by the pasturage of flocks. They are somewhat numerous in the cities and villages; but are mostly employed in the country, in the cultivation of the soil. Their number is estimated at one hundred and forty thousand. They live in patriarchal style, often with three or four generations in a family. The average number in a family is estimated at ten.

Reading and books are not common among the Nestorians, being mostly confined to the clergy. A majority of the priesthood chant their service, in ancient Syriac, without understanding it.

The Nestorians are a national church, organized on the principle that all the children are members of the church and nation by birth, and members of both alike. The church is governed by a patriarch, whose residence is at present in the village of Diz, in one of the most inaccessible parts of the Koordish mountains. This has been his residence since 1590. Previously, he resided at Elkosh, near Mosul; earlier still, at Bagdad, and originally at Seleucia.

The Nestorians have nine orders of clergy, the principal of which are bishops, priests and deacons. They require celibacy

of the bishops and superior orders of the clergy, but allow marriage to priests and the lower orders. They also require abstinence from animal food.

On the western side of the Koordish mountains some converts have been made among the Nestorians to the Papacy, but the principal part of the nation adheres to its ancient traditionary faith and church order. The power to ordain is restricted to the episcopal orders. The office of bishop is generally transmitted in the same family, but is not strictly hereditary, marriage not being allowed. There being no sons to inherit the office, it passes to nephews and other near relations. Bishops are appointed and consecrated by the patriarch. Their whole number is said to be eighteen, four of whom reside at Oroomiah. In their worship the Nestorians make frequent use of the Nicene creed.

The Nestorians who have submitted to the Pope are called United Nestorians and Chaldean Christians. The government of the Nestorian church is essentially despotic, being in the hands of the priesthood, who hold their offices for life, and are responsible only to their superiors.

The average longevity of the Persians, embracing the Christian population and others, is fifteen or twenty years less than in the United States and England. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. III., pp. 120—126, 354, 487. Residence in Persia, by J. Perkins, pp. 1—24, 408.

CHAPTER III.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

THERE is a tradition that Abgarus, king of Armenia, whose metropolis was Edessa, in Mesopotamia, was converted, during the life of Christ, by hearing of his wonderful works; and that he sent a messenger to invite the Saviour to his court. It is further related that Thomas, by the command of the Saviour, sent Thaddeus, one of the seventy, to Edessa, who performed a miraculous cure on king Abgarus, and baptized him, with many of his people. The successors of Abgarus, however, apostatized from the Christian faith, and persecuted the Christian cause with merciless severity. But they did not prevail against it. The church retained its position in that country, as it did in all others where it was introduced, and gradually triumphed over its opposers.

When the Monophysite doctrine of one nature in Christ was proposed by Eutyches, abbot of a convent near Constantinople, and extensively received in the East, though condemned by the council at Chalcedon, A. D. 451, it was extensively received in Armenia; and in 491 a synod of Armenian bishops rejected the decisions of the council of Chalcedon, and thus cut themselves off from communion with the other great branches of the Christian church.

From this time, the Armenian church has been an independent establishment, and has steadily persisted in maintaining the Monophysite doctrine, that the divine and human natures in Christ are so blended as to form but one nature, and that consequently he has no human soul separate from the divine.

The government of the Armenians is episcopal and patriarchal.

Originally they had a single patriarchal head, called Catholicos, residing at the imperial residence. In modern times they have three catholicoses, one at Echmiadzin, one at Aghtamar, and one at Cis, in the ancient province of Cilicia. Of these the Echmiadzin catholicos is the greatest. The catholicos ordains bishops, and consecrates the holy oil which is used in their religious ceremonies; and derives a considerable revenue from furnishing this article.

Since Echmiadzin has fallen under the power of the Russians, the Turkish portions of his jurisdiction have continued to acknowledge the Echmiadzin catholicos as their spiritual head, and to constitute a part of his flock. The principal orders of Armenian clergy are catholicos, patriarchs, bishops, vartabeds, priests and deacons. All below the bishop are ordained by the bishop, the bishop by the catholicos, and the catholicos is chosen by a council of bishops.

The Armenians have two patriarchs established by the Turkish authorities; those of Constantinople and Jerusalem. These officers have only the rank of bishops, but they are clothed by the Turkish government with great political power. The Armenian patriarch of Constantinople has the power of imprisoning and scourging the members of his flock at pleasure; and, till recently, could easily procure their banishment, whenever he pleased.

The late charter given by the Sultan to his subjects, however, will, if carried into effect, prevent his doing this without giving the accused a trial before the Turkish courts.

The vartabeds are a collateral order with the priests. The priests are all married previous to their ordination, no others being eligible to the priestly office. The vartabeds never marry, but are under vows of perpetual celibacy. The vartabeds are all preachers; the priests never preach. The vartabeds live in convents, or in church enclosures; and the priests live in the midst of their flocks, and mingle freely with them. On the death of his wife, a priest is not permitted to marry again, but

may, if he chooses, become a vartabed. The priests always remain priests, and can never rise to the office of bishops. The bishops are all taken from the order of vartabeds, and are called aratch norts.

The Armenians hold to seven sacraments, like the Latins. They baptize infants by a tri-immersion, and pouring water three times on their heads. They believe in transubstantiation, and worship the elements; reject the doctrine of purgatory, but pray for the dead; worship the virgin Mary, confess to the priests, and perform penances.

The Armenian churches are opened twice every day, for morning and evening prayers. The mass, occupying six hours in its performance, is performed daily, in the large city churches. In the ordinary morning and evening prayers, the people kneel and cross themselves in rapid succession, while the priest chants the prayers. In some places they kneel, and continue quietly in the kneeling posture, till the service is completed.

The Scriptures are read in the ancient Armenian, which is a dead language to most; and preaching is rare among them, except on great days. The priests only read prayers and say mass. They have fourteen great feast-days in the course of the year, in which labor is suspended. They fast forty days before Easter, six days before Christmas, and have two weekly fasts, Wednesdays and Fridays. Their fasting is abstaining from animal food alone.

Girls among the Armenians are often married at the age of twelve or thirteen, and men from twenty-five to thirty.

The Armenians abstain from blood, and things strangled. Their system of Monachism is that of St. Basil. Their country fell under the power of the Turks in 1552, and has since constituted a part of the Turkish empire.—H. G. O. Dwight's Coleman's Christian Antiquities, pp. 466—474.

CHAPTER IV.

THE COPTIC CHURCH.

The Coptic church is the lineal successor of the ancient Christian churches of Egypt. The title Copt is derived from the Greek *Αιγυπτιος*, and signifies simply Egyptian. The Coptic version of the New Testament is one of the most ancient versions extant, dating, according to some, as early as the second century, and judged by none to be later than the fifth. They are supposed to number between four hundred thousand and five hundred thousand, and are devoted to agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and other higher employments. They are governed by the patriarch of Alexandria, successor of the ancient patriarch of that place; and their ecclesiastical polity is similar to that of the Greek church. Great exertions have been made to secure their adhesion to the church of Rome, but without effect.

The Copts inhabit Egypt, Nubia, and the countries adjacent. In respect to race, they are an intermediate variety between the negro and the fairer tribes of the north.

The long series of oppressions to which they have been subjected, under the rule of the Turks, has greatly reduced their number, and corrupted their characters; but, with all these disadvantages, they show capabilities for the attainment of a high state of civilization.

Their church polity, and religious principles and usages, are essentially the same as those of the Armenian church; and their principal departure from the Greek church is in respect to the single nature of Christ. On this point they differ from the Greeks and Latins, and agree with the Armenians and ancient Monophysites.

The patriarch of Alexandria resides at Cairo, and has ten bishoprics under him. They have the Bible and ancient liturgies in the Coptic language, which is the same that was used in Egypt under the Ptolemies, but is now a dead language.

They baptize their children always in church, never till they are forty days old, and frequently not till they are seven years of age; and, immediately after baptism, they administer to them the Lord's supper. They celebrate the Lord's supper with leavened bread, and partake the wine with spoons. The Copts of Upper Egypt practise circumcision. The others do not. Their public divine service consists of singing, prayers, and reading the Scriptures, ordinarily, without preaching. The patriarch preaches once a year.

Monachism originated in Egypt, and the Coptic church still retains it; but its convents are not numerous, nor largely attended.

CHAPTER V.

THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

The Abyssinians received Christianity before the middle of the fourth century. Their form of Christianity, however, is peculiar, with a large infusion of Judaism. They practise circumcision, receive the Jewish doctrine of clean and unclean meats, observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and adopt the Monophysite doctrine of a single nature in Christ.

In public worship they use the Bible and the apocryphal books, and administer baptism and the eucharist according to the ritual of the Greek church. They also observe the same festivals and fasts as the Greeks. They differ, however, from most other churches, ancient and modern, in not admitting com-

municants to partake of the eucharist till their twenty-fifth year of age.

Their churches are usually built on hills, and in a small, round, conical form, and are decorated with pictures. Worshippers are required to stand, as in the Greek churches, during divine service. They leave their shoes at the door, and persons on horses, in passing, are required to dismount. Their service consists principally in selections from the Bible, and in prayers, and is similar to that of the Greeks.

The clergy are allowed to marry, and the patriarch, called *Abuna*, father, is generally taken from the Coptic priests. They have monks, who profess to be of the order of St. Augustine, and are of two classes: 1. The married monks, living in convents. 2. Married religionists, living with their wives and children, around the churches, and subsisting principally by agriculture and other secular employments. Their nuns, also, are numerous. The Abyssinian clergy have no clerical dress.

Great efforts have been made to reduce the Abyssinian church to subjection to the Roman Papacy; but without effect.

The Abyssinians are more numerous and in better circumstances than the Copts; but they depend on the patriarch of Alexandria, and allow him to appoint their patriarch. This has been a constant usage ever since the founding of this church, about A. D. 450, when the first bishop of the Abyssinians received consecration from Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. — Murdock's Mosheim. Encyclopedia Americana.

CHAPTER VI.

THE INEFFICIENCY OF EASTERN CHRISTIANITY, AND ITS RADICAL VICES.

All the patriarchal churches are monuments of the past, and wrecks and remnants of its glory and power. They are stereotype systems of church polity, that have been experimented upon incessantly, for more than a thousand years, with no grand beneficial result. There is doubtless some piety among them, but their subjects are not generally wise and good; neither are they prosperous, powerful and happy. No great light of the world has risen among them. They have produced no long list of benefactors of the human race; no great discoveries in science, no great world-instructing artists, no great improvers of the arts of life. Where their fathers were a thousand years ago, there their sons are now; no wiser, no greater, no better; but rather less wise, less good, and less influential in the world's great affairs.

Europe has been awakened to new life, and her swarming millions are abroad, on every land and every sea, trying to improve their conditions, and multiply their enjoyments. New continents have been discovered, new arts invented, and new sciences constructed; but the subjects of the Eastern patriarchal and priestly despotisms are still slumbering under the night of ages, without any participation whatever in the mighty movements which are going on around them. What more decisive evidence can exist of the radical corruption of these systems? Their religion does not save its votaries. The glory of God is departed from them.

The cradle of the human race is a moral desert, and the scene of the early triumphs of Christianity, and of some of its most

glorious achievements, has become the theatre of its corruption and debasement, till the salt has entirely lost its savor, and is henceforth good for nothing but to be cast away and trodden under foot.

How dark has been their night of ages, and how comfortless! The way of transgressors is indeed hard. They that hate me, says divine wisdom, love death.

The Eastern patriarchal religions do not meet the exigences of weak, erring and suffering humanity. They do not make men holy, industrious, enterprising, prosperous and happy, to the extent which is imperatively demanded. Their votaries are ignorant and superstitious, and the subjects of numerous destructive vices. They are tyrannical masters, and ignoble slaves. They have originated no great ideas; they have accomplished no great works. The descendants of the ancient Greeks, who were almost the demi-gods of the human race in elder time, they have fallen from their proud eminence, and have been, for many centuries, the slaves of Mohammedan despotism and semi-barbarism, superimposed on their own domestic burdens.

In the West, fallen and corrupted as religion was, it retained sufficient power, on the overthrow of the Roman empire, to conquer its conquerors, and become the controlling principle of their civilization. It did not make them all they might have been, nor exalt them to the eminent holiness they might have attained; but it vastly improved them. And many of them it illuminated with that divine light which crowns this life with unspeakable glory, and is our proper and adequate preparation for the life to come. The conquerors of the West adopted the principles and usages of the conquered, and became as good and zealous Christians as they were. In a short time all were assimilated together, and enjoyed the blessings of the state, whatever they were, in common.

But in the East it was not so. Not only was the corruption of religion so thorough and complete that the Eastern Christians could not stand against their Mohammedan neighbors, and repel

their incursions; when the overflowing scourge passed over, they had no power of *moral conquest and assimilation*, with which to subdue them. Bad as the Mohammedan principles were, defective and inadequate as they were to work out the highest possible improvement and happiness of society, the Eastern church principles were no better, and, in some respects, they were worse. They led to more effeminacy and imbecility. They were more slavish, and afforded a better discipline to prepare its subjects for slavery.

When the light of the Byzantine empire went out, under the rule of Mohammedan conquerors, the world was very little darker than before. Mohammedan rule met the necessities of human society nearly as well as the corrupt Christian rule had done that preceded it. The Eastern Christians could not convert their conquerors, because they could not exhibit any great practical benefits which their Christianity could confer upon them. The two systems pursued their career side by side. They went on together, and were transmitted to the descendants of their respective supporters from generation to generation; but the good and evil of both were so nearly equal, that it was impossible for either to make much impression on the other. Their excellences were different, their evils were different; but their practical working did not give any results by which either could gain a decided advantage over the other.

This experiment has been prosecuted from the fall of Constantinople, in 1453, four hundred years, till the present time, and both religions, Mohammedan superstition and Greek Christianity, have been found utterly ineffectual for the exaltation of their subjects, and each incapable of subduing and overpowering the other by the force of its beneficent results.

In the mean time, reörganizations of the church on better principles in Western Europe and America have produced vast improvements in the moral and social condition of their subjects, and new impulses have been given to all the great interests of society originating in this source.

One of the great improvements growing out of this revolutionary religious movement in the West is the reëstablishment of religious liberty in the church, and the promotion of corresponding liberty and equality in the state. Already have these changes begun to act on the spiritual and political despotisms of the East, to restrict their operation, and to weaken their power.

Great organic changes for the better have been effected in Turkey and Persia, within the last few years; not through the elevating and ennobling influence either of Mohammedanism or Eastern Christianity, but through the influence of the religion and liberty of Western Europe and America. Still greater changes are to come from the same source.

That which blesses and benefits will make its way, be sought after and pursued, and be cherished and cultivated. That which debases, and otherwise depresses and injures, will be abandoned and rejected. An injurious and depressing religion cannot always impose on the credulity of mankind; nor can an elevating and ennobling one always be unappreciated. Religions not only *may* be judged by their fruits; they must be judged by their fruits, and must be chosen or rejected ultimately by the human race, as their fruits are beneficial or injurious.

The great fundamental and damning error of the Eastern church is its spiritual despotism. The hierarchy lords it over God's heritage, and reduces his subjects to ignoble bondage. The slavery of Egypt under taskmasters, in making bricks without straw, was not so bad as the slavery of Eastern Christians under their hierarchies. The bondage of Egypt related to the body, but left the mind unshackled; the bondage of the Eastern churches lays violent hands and imposes shackles on the mind. It guides faith by authority, and never allows its children to walk alone. They, consequently, never can generally be men.

The ministry is debased by the hierarchical system, and is made an instrument of the systematic debasement of the people.

Some of the church of England divines, who have been sent

to the East as missionaries, supposed, at first, that the hereditary and traditionary churches of that portion of the world were essentially right, and only needed a little improving. But further acquaintance with them, and a little experimenting on their characters and capabilities, soon taught them their mistake. The sin of those churches is radical and fundamental. Their polity is wrong in principle, in its fundamental principle; and it can never be reformed. The churches must be abandoned and overthrown, and give place to others, founded on better and Gospel principles.

The original polity of the church was one of liberty. It recognized the membership as *fit* to be trusted, to think for themselves. It gave them the blessed word of God, and encouraged them to study it, and learn from it as much as possible. It interposed no human authority between God and the believer, and subjected him to no law but that of his Maker. It made him, however lowly, a member of the *royal priesthood* of the Gospel, and taught him to aspire to a noble destiny. It made him Christlike, Godlike. His mind was radiant with divine light; his heart glowed with divine love. He walked with God; he yearned for the salvation of men, and strove to bless them.

The entire membership were a sacred ministry, preaching the Gospel with the convincing evidences of a holy and happy life, and commending it, with irresistible power, to the consciences and hearts of men.

They were no weak enthusiasts, pursuing a bubble that bursts and perishes with the seizing of it. Still less were they the votaries of a blind and dead conservatism, that hoards alike the chaff with the wheat, and can, on no account, consent to a separation of them; but they were noble and generous men, that knew their God and Saviour, and worshipped him with boundless love, boundless joy, and exalted virtue. They were intelligent, thoughtful, benevolent and magnanimous men, who loved their neighbors as themselves; Davids and Jonathans, in a kind and heroic affection for each other, and in mutual well-doing.

Their words were with power; and fell on the hearts of men, not like snow on the rock, but like grain on the fruitful field, to germinate and grow, and come back again with large increase. They were men to meet the demands of their times, and to meet the demands of all times. The eye that saw them blessed them, and the ear drank in their words like the refreshing rain. God was with them; God was in them. The mighty power of the Holy Spirit was on them; and hard hearts melted, and stubborn wills bowed, under their fervent and soul-stirring appeals.

A country inhabited by such men could never have been vanquished in war, or overrun by an enemy; and a church producing such men, and raising its children to such a pitch of excellence and glory, could never have existed for four hundred years amid the twilight gloom of Mohammedanism, without dispelling its shades, and compelling a universal recognition of its own superior excellence and moral worth.

Christ charged the Jewish church with being in a state of moral death at the time of his advent. The apostles reiterated the charge; and time speedily verified it, under the operation of the divine judgments.

The Eastern churches are dead. They are a valley of dry bones. The judgments of God, that came upon the corrupt Jews and overwhelmed them, have come upon the corrupt Greeks and overwhelmed them. There is no true and genial life in the ancient churches in Turkey. There is none in the church of Russia. The Russian church is a great instrument of civil and spiritual despotism. It is the subordinate and dependant on the state; and exists for the glory of its sovereign, not for the glory of God, or the indefinite elevation and improvement of man.

Without religious liberty, Russia will never accomplish an exalted destiny, nor illustrate the power of religion and the glory of God. Greece has become independent, in modern times, without raising herself in the scale of moral dignity, wealth and glory. Her church is a branch of the great Greek church, with

all its corruptions in doctrine, and with all its absolute priestly despotism; and the result is, that death reigns in it, and death reigns under its sway. Like that blasting upas-tree, no green thing can grow within the reach of its pestiferous influence, or flourish under its shade.

The missionary operations of the modern churches, commenced in the East, whatever imperfections may attend them, have this advantage, that all their organizations are essentially free. They appeal to the Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith, and to the law of God and right as the only valid and supreme rule of moral action; and call the people to behold their God, and love, worship and serve him, as their true hope and portion. Such a service is their unspeakable privilege and highest duty, and will, with the divine blessing, become the instrument of their indefinite exaltation.

Great changes may be expected from the influence of a pure Gospel, and a church polity recognizing the essential rights and liberties of mankind, in the Eastern world. The leaven of this improving principle is already there, and is beginning to show its power. New revolutionary organizations have been commenced in most of the principal cities, and many converts made; and it is to be hoped that the day is not distant when the churches of God in Constantinople, and other principal cities of the Turkish empire, will rival the glory and usefulness of the ancient and primitive churches in those regions.

DIVISION II.

THE PAPAL CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE PAPAL CHURCH, AND ITS HIERARCHY.

The Papal church, otherwise denominated Roman Catholic, is the largest, and, in some respects, the mightiest sovereignty that ever existed. It embraces more members than all the rest of Christendom together. According to Malte Brun, the whole number of Roman Catholics throughout the world is, 116,000,000.
According to Hassel, ... 139,000,000.
According to the American Encyclopedia, . . 124,672,000.
The whole number of the Greek and other Eastern churches is estimated at, ... 60,000,000.
Protestants at, ... 60,000,000.

None of these estimates can be considered as anything more than remote approximations to the truth; but, as such, they show that the power of numbers is on the side of the Roman Catholics.

All these millions of Roman Catholics are the subjects of a single spiritual sovereign, the Pope, and are the most thoroughly drilled in the doctrines and practice of obedience and subjection, of any community on earth. Besides being strong in numbers, this church is rich in money, lands, dwellings and church edifices. Its property is enormous, and is an instrument of enormous power in the prosecution of its purposes. Its wealth is the result of the acquisitions and accumulations of ages, and is capable of being wielded to exert a controlling influence on human affairs, not for the present only, but for ages and ages

to come It boasts a remote antiquity, and some of its branches claim, apparently with good reason, to have come down, in unbroken succession, from the times of the apostles. This is the case with the church of Rome itself. But, in the process of ages, permanent associations are liable to great changes. They undergo many perceptible and violent changes; they undergo many that are imperceptible. It is impossible to avoid change, however strenuously it may be resisted. States change, and churches change, by laws of causalty that are beyond human control.

The fact, therefore, that some portions of the Papal church stand in lineal succession to the churches of the apostles, does not prove that they are now apostolic churches. Neither does it prove anything important to that conclusion. An apostolic Christian church is one organized and administered on the principles of the apostolic churches. Such a church is just as apostolic if it was organized by a secession from a corrupt church sixty years ago, as if it had been perpetuated down to our times, in one unbroken line of succession, from the apostles. Apostolic succession, therefore, proves nothing, but is liable, in the minds of the ignorant and undiscriminating, to create a prejudice in favor of unworthy claimants.

The great question by which to determine the apostolic character of churches is, are they organized and administered on apostolic and Gospel principles?

To apply this to the Papal church, we ask, is that church constituted and administered according to Gospel and apostolic principles? If it is, it is an apostolic church. If it is not, it is not an apostolic church.

Let us look, then, at the polity of this church, and see what it is. What is its ministry?

One supreme head and father, the Pope.

Seventy cardinals, of whom six are bishops, fifty priests, and fourteen deacons;

An indefinite number of archbishops;

An indefinite number of bishops,
Archdeacons,
Deans,
Priests,
Deacons and sub-deacons, &c.

Those who live in monasteries, and are subject to monastic rules, are called regular clergy; and others, secular.

CHAPTER II.

THE POPE.

The word Pope is derived from the Greek παπας, father. It was originally applied to all bishops; and, before the time of Sabianus, A. D. 604, the bishops of Rome were styled bishops, in common with other bishops. So the title Pope or Father was applied to all bishops until the time of Hildebrand, near the close of the eleventh century, when it was restricted by authority to the bishops of Rome.

The Pope has the double character of a temporal and spiritual sovereign, and wears a triple crown. The first presented to Bishop Symmachus, A. D. 498; the second, added by Boniface, in 1294; and the third, by John XXII., A. D. 1316.

The Papal states embrace a central district in Italy, lying on both sides of the Tiber, and extending from the Mediterranean Sea to the Gulf of Venice, with Naples on the south, and Tuscany on the north. It contains seventeen thousand four hundred and ninety-four square miles, and two million eight hundred and ninety-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty-five inhabitants; not half as large as the state of New York by a difference of eleven thousand square miles, but it is a little more than twice as large, as the state of Massachusetts. Its principal city is Rome, the "Niobe of nations," illustrious as the seat of the

ancient empire of the Romans, through every possible change in the form of their government; and, now that the Roman empire has long since passed away, the metropolis of a spiritual sovereignty, the oldest, strongest and mightiest, that the world has ever seen, in comparison with which the empire of the Cæsars was insignificant. It is distinguished, also, for the magnificence of its churches, among which is St. Peter's, the most costly fabric of the kind in the world; probably the most costly one that has ever existed; the decaying monuments of its ancient glories, its paintings, statues, and other curious works; but not distinguished for the piety, enterprise, or philanthropy, of its people.

St. Peter's church occupied one hundred and eleven years in being built, and cost an amount equal to one hundred and sixty million dollars. The Vatican, one of the Pope's palaces, is a vast collection of edifices, supposed to contain ten thousand rooms. The population of Rome is one hundred and eighty thousand, embracing not less than thirty-five bishops, one thousand four hundred priests, and three thousand four hundred monks and nuns. As a temporal sovereign, the Pope's power is absolute. He is one of the earth's despots, and lends all the influence of his example to encourage despotism, and to keep it in credit.

He has enjoyed this sovereignty from the time of Pepin, king of the Franks, from whom he is said to have received it, A. D. 754.

Our Lord did not desire a temporal sovereignty; and, when the people were disposed to press it upon him, he refused it. The Popes of Rome have not thought proper to imitate his example. The apostles did not aspire to temporal sovereignties. In accepting and holding such a sovereignty, the Pope of Rome is departing widely from the example both of the divine Master whom he professes to represent, and of the apostles to whose office and authority he claims to have succeeded.

How poorly this temporal sovereignty is administered, appears from the fact that railroads, telegraphs, daily and weekly news-

papers, and monthly and quarterly periodicals, do not flourish there; that beggars are numerous, and that a large portion of the people are in the lowest state of poverty and wretchedness.

The spiritual sovereignty of the Pope is as absolute as his temporal sovereignty.

He is the absolute spiritual sovereign of the entire Roman Catholic church throughout the whole world, and administers its government. He decides controversies respecting matters of faith; makes laws as he judges occasions to require; executes them, and the other laws of the Papacy; calls general councils, and moderates them; rectifies or annuls their decrees; sends legates and nuncios to distant provinces; corrects abuses; annuls grants of episcopal dignities; exercises a censorship of the press; regulates the liturgy; canonizes saints; appoints and abolishes festivals; establishes and suppresses religious orders; confirms and deposes bishops; dispenses with laws, and releases subjects from the obligations of vows, &c.

How entirely foreign is such a despotism from the ministry of the New Testament!

CHAPTER III

THE CARDINALS.

The Cardinals are seventy in number, and constitute the Pope's electoral college. This court had its origin in the eleventh century. Previous to Nicalaus II., who ascended the Papal throne 1058, the Popes were elected by the whole Roman clergy, assisted by eminent military gentlemen and nobles. This often led to great disorders. Nicalaus II. ordered that the cardinal bishops and cardinal presbyters should elect, yet without infringing on any of the established rights of the Roman emperors in

the business. He then required the assent of the other legal voters, but did not give them any participation in the primary vote.

Altercations still arising from the regulation requiring the assent of the people to the vote for a Pope, Alexander III., A. D. 1179, in a council at Rome, called the third Lateran council, ordained that the right of voting for a new Pope should belong exclusively to the cardinals, and that the person who had a two-thirds vote should be considered elected. By this means, the people and clergy of Rome were excluded from their immemorial right of voting for their bishop.

In the same council, he, first of all the Popes, sanctioned a crusade against heretics, took from the bishops and councils the right of proposing saints for canonization, and assumed the power of creating kings.

The primitive cardinals were the seven bishops of Ostia, Porto Albano, St. Rufina, Frascati, Palestrina, and La Sabina, places in and about the city of Rome. These long before bore the title of Cardinal Bishops. The cardinal presbyters were the ministers who had charge of the twenty-eight parishes, or principal churches, of the city of Rome. All the remaining clergy Nicalaus excluded from the office of electors, and left them merely the right of approving or disapproving of the elections.

Alexander III., to put an end to the disgraceful tumults that were liable to arise on the occasion of an election of the Pope in this method, enlarged the electoral college by adding to it certain priests of high rank and influence, with other distinguished citizens. By this artifice the disfranchised party were vanquished. This is the history of the organization of the electoral college for the choice of Popes.

The college being once constituted, it was left to the Pope to appoint all future cardinals. It is not necessary, however, that the number should be always complete. In modern times, more or less vacancies have been allowed among the cardinal priests and deacons.

The cardinals dress is a surplice, with a short purple mantle, and a small cap, over which they wear a hat, with silk strings and tassels. The color is either red or violet.

The cardinals form the Pope's standing council, both in the church and state, and are divided into different committees for the more convenient despatch of business. Some of them have the principal offices in the papal court, as secretary of state, chancellor, &c.

They are required to meet for the election of a new Pope ten days after the death of the previous one, and are not allowed to adjourn till a choice is made. They choose the Pope from themselves, none but a cardinal being eligible to that office.

Where are the cardinals of the New Testament? Nowhere.

CHAPTER IV.

PROVINCIAL, DIOCESAN AND PAROCHIAL CLERGY.

Archbishops.

ARCHBISHOPS are metropolitan prelates, having bishops under them. They are elected by archepiscopal chapters, and confirmed by the Pope. This order had its origin in 341, when the council of Antioch elevated a portion of its bishops to this office, and gave them the supervision of several dioceses, under the title of provinces.

The archbishops have jurisdiction over their bishops in cases not of a criminal nature; appellate jurisdiction from the bishops' courts; the right of convoking a provincial synod, which they are required to call once in three years; the right of presiding in the same; the charge of enforcing the rules of the church, remedying abuses, distributing indulgences, having the cross carried before them, if the Pope or a legate is not present, and of wearing the archepiscopal pallium.

There is an archbishop of the United States, who resides at Baltimore. There are nine archbishops in France, eight in Spain, two in Portugal, three in Hungary, four in Ireland, and thirty-eight in Italy.

Bishops.

Bishops preside over dioceses consisting of a considerable number of parishes, administer ordination and confirmation, consecrate church edifices, hold diocesan conventions, &c. The establishment of the office of diocesan bishop was the first important innovation on the democratic polity of Christ and the apostles. There is no such office recognized in the New Testament, the bishops of that period being the same as the presbyters, and all being parish ministers, with equal powers. The establishment of this office took place gradually, in connection with the rise and prevalence of provincial councils; and its powers, at first but little advanced beyond those of presbyters, in process of time became much greater.

It is the duty of bishops to visit and examine, from time to time, every part of their diocese, administer its revenues, superintend convents, try heresies, violations of ecclesiastical law, and immoralities, &c.

Priests.

Priests are that class of the clergy who administer the Lord's supper, conduct public religious worship, expound and enforce the Gospel, and have the general instruction and oversight of single parishes.

Priests are father-confessors, and hear confessions from all the members of their respective churches. They also administer absolution on such grounds as they judge sufficient, and declare persons absolved from their sins. Priests are ordained, located and removed, by the bishops, at their discretion.

Deacons and Subdeacons.

Deacons and subdeacons are inferior orders of clergy, whose business it is to assist the priests and higher clergy in administering church ordinances, and, by permission of their superiors, are authorized to administer baptism, preach, and perform other clerical duties.

The Papal church uses a liturgy in Latin, the same in all nations, and perfectly unintelligible to multitudes of its worshippers.

The clergy are required to maintain perpetual celibacy; and religious orders under vows of perpetual celibacy, poverty, and obedience to superiors, are encouraged in both sexes.

The system, from top to bottom, is one of perfect despotism on the part of the superior orders, and implicit submission on the part of the inferiors. The laity are nothing; the clergy are everything. The entire government of the church is in the hands of the clergy, and the clergy perpetuates its own order.

It is claimed that the church is an infallible expounder of Christianity; that it is a perfect and safe guide into all truth. But this practically means the clergy, and primarily the Pope, their head and master. A more audacious and blasphemous claim was never set up in favor of ignorance, imbecility and wickedness. It belies all history; is directly in conflict with the Scriptures, which forbid us to trust in man, or to call any man father; and is calculated to foster boundless credulity and superstition.

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINES AND USAGES OF THE PAPAL CHURCH.

1. The Papal church claims to be the exclusive church of Christ on earth, and denounces all other denominations of professed Christians as heretics and schismatics.

2. It denies that there is any salvation out of its communion, and the most distinguished prelates, and other clergy, are required to insist upon this in their public preaching.

3. It claims to be an infallible interpreter of the Scriptures, and an infallible expounder of the doctrines and duties of Christianity; and denies the right of private interpretation to its ministry and membership, and to the world at large.

4. It does not receive the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures as standards, but adopts a Latin version, called the Vulgate, as its standard Bible, very consistently on the supposition of its infallibility; for, if the Papal church is really infallible, that version must be perfect. But all translations are necessarily imperfect, and this equally with others.

5. It receives seven sacraments: 1. Baptism. 2. Confirmation. 3. The eucharist. 4. Penance. 5. Extreme unction. 6. Holy orders. 7. Marriage.

These sacraments are supposed to confer grace by a direct influence.

The eucharist is considered as attended with the actual transformation of the elements into the body of Christ, and to be a repeated offering of that illustrious victim as a sacrifice, under the Latin title of Hostia, a victim, and the English title of the Mass. This was first proposed, 831, by Radbert, afterwards abbot of Corbey, and declared a doctrine of the church in 1215.

Hildebrand, 1079, had pronounced against it on the authority of the virgin Mary. — White's Universal History, p. 250.

6. It establishes religious orders for both sexes, under vows of perpetual celibacy, poverty and obedience.

One of the most important of these is the Jesuits, founded by Ignatius Loyola, and established by a bull of Paul III., A. D. 1540.

7. It imposes celibacy on all its clergy.

The celibacy of the clergy began to be advocated directly after the institution of the monastic orders. It was proposed to be demanded of all the clergy at the council of Nice, A. D. 325; but the proposition was defeated, and permission was granted to married clergymen to retain their wives. It soon after, however, came to be generally required in the West, and of the higher clergy in the East.

8. It teaches the doctrine of purgatory, and enjoins prayers for the dead. Purgatory denotes a place of discipline and improvement after death, where those not fitted to enter immediately upon the heavenly state undergo temporary punishments for their sins. The doctrine of purgatory began to appear in the second century. In the third century some located purgatory in the sun and moon; the moon being supposed to effect a purgation by holy water, and the sun by fire.

Origen and others supposed that the souls of the saints remain in a certain place in the earth, which the Scriptures call paradise, as in a place of instruction, or school of souls.

The council of Trent confirmed the doctrine of purgatory, as agreeable to the Scriptures and the traditions of the church. The Protestant churches, and the Greek church, do not receive it.

With the doctrine of purgatory is connected that of prayers and masses for the dead.

Judas Maccabeus caused prayers and sacrifices to be offered for his soldiers who had fallen in battle, and who had about their persons the symbols of idolatry; "doing thereby well and gen-

erously, says the writer, and counting on the resurrection. For, if he had not expected that the slain would have a resurrection, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead. His pious and holy thought, considering that for those who sleep in piety, the greatest favor is laid up; on this account he made propitiation for the dead, that they might be absolved from sin." —2 Maccabees 12: 43—45.

The early church-fathers teach that purgatory is in the vicinity of hell, and that its fires occasion the most overwhelming distress and anguish. The doctrine of purgatory is supposed to have been introduced into Christianity from Plato.

Prayers for the dead were common among Christians in early times, and form an important part of Catholic worship.

9. It teaches the worship of saints.

Previous to the establishment of Christianity, and subsequently, the deceased Roman emperors and others were made objects of religious worship. The worship of saints was introduced into the Christian church almost immediately after the times of the apostles. In the fourth century the Egyptians embalmed the bodies of reputed saints, and worshipped them in their houses.

The martyrs and other eminent saints were supposed to have great power with God as intercessors for their surviving fellowmen, and their aid was assiduously sought both in public and private. In the fourth century, however, the worship of Mary was not exalted above that of other saints.

The worship of angels began with Ambrose, 374—397.

10. It requires auricular confession to the priests.

Auricular confession is the acknowledgment of sin to a priest, at the confessional, with a view to obtain absolution. The priest is called the Father-confessor. The persons confessing are not allowed to conceal any sin which they remember, and the father-confessor is bound to perpetual secrecy. The absolution granted is supposed to have sacramental efficacy.

The members of the Catholic church are required to confess to the priest at least once a year.

Catholic churches are provided with cells for the accommodation of confessors, denominated confessionals.

11. It has been and still is a persecuting church.

Persecution of heretics was introduced into the church almost immediately after it came into the possession of civil power, under Constantine and his successors. But, during the dark ages, the persecuting spirit was very much increased. In this business, for a time, the bishops took the lead; but, in A. D. 1229, it was ordered, by the Council of Toulouse, that there should be a board of inquisitors in each city for this purpose, composed of one clergyman and three laymen. In A. D. 1233 Pope Gregory IX. released the bishops from all direct responsibility in this matter, and confined the privilege of acting as inquisitors to the preaching monks, particularly the Dominicans. Soon after this, wherever the Dominican monks had convents, inquisitorial courts were appointed out of that religious order. These courts first originated in France, and were then extended to other countries.

This court had its origin previous to 1215 A. D. Innocent III., in the Lateran council, approved and confirmed it in that year, showing that it had previously been introduced.

The object of the inquisition was the extirpation of heretics; and this it prosecuted for ages, with a merciless violence and cruelty that is without precedent or parallel in the history of the human race.

The number of martyrs that have died at the stake, in religious wars, by other methods of execution, and in the gloomy dungeons of the inquisition, by the authority of the Catholic church, is immense. It would exceed millions.

The general councils of Constance and Basle had attempted to effect some reformations in the doctrines and discipline of the Catholic church. There was a wide-spread discontent among Catholics, and reformation was loudly demanded. But all

attempts at reformation by these councils were frustrated by the Popes. Still further efforts in this direction were desired. This was opposed for a long time by the Popes; but, at length, yielding to the extreme urgency of the demand, Paul III. called a general council to meet at Trent, sixty-five miles north-west of Venice. This council commenced its sessions December, 1545, and continued them till the same month in 1563, eighteen years. It was opened with twenty-five bishops, and some other prelates. In April, 1546, the number had increased to five archbishops and forty-eight bishops, when the Apocrypha was admitted into the canon of the sacred Scriptures, tradition declared of equal authority with the Bible, the Latin Vulgate adopted as the standard word of God, and the church declared its only true interpreter. In the latter sessions of this council, two hundred and thirty prelates were present, which was still further increased by a delegation from France, Nov. 13, 1562, by Cardinal Lorraine, with fourteen bishops, three abbots and eighteen theologians. The reformations made by this council were mostly unimportant. The cause and many of the principles of Protestantism were argued before it, but with no considerable effect.

The council of Basle, in Switzerland, was commenced Dec. 14, 1431, and closed 1449, eighteen years. Near the close it was transferred to Lusanne. Its numbers amounted, in some of its sessions, to four hundred. One of its most remarkable acts was the deposition of Pope Eugenius IV. This council endeavored to limit the power of the Popes, but failed.

The council of Constance was held at Constance, from 1414 to 1418, four years. It was attended by Charles V., emperor of Germany, the Pope, twenty-six princes, one hundred and forty counts, twenty cardinals, seven patriarchs, twenty archbishops, ninety-one bishops, six hundred other clerical dignitaries and doctors, and four thousand priests. It condemned John Huss and Jerome of Prague, as arch-heretics, to be burned; a sentence that was executed by the civil authorities of Constance. John

Huss was burned alive, July 6, 1415; and Jerome of Prague, May 30, 1416.

In Spain alone, the victims of the inquisition, from 1481 to 1808, is estimated at 341,021; of these, were burnt at the stake, 31,912.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DESPOTIC CHARACTER OF THE PAPACY.

THE Papal hierarchy is not only the great spiritual despotism of the time, but it is the prime conspirator against the liberties of the human race. It is the great and deadly foe of all rational liberty in church or state. It is the friend and patron of tyrants, and their powerful coadjutor. It is the persecutor and destroyer of the wise and good. The martyrs to liberty and true religion whom it has inhumanly murdered, in the prosecution of its fiendish lusts of power and self-aggrandizement, are an innumerable company, embracing all ages and both sexes.

No wonder that their cry beneath the altar in heaven fell on the ear and touched the heart of the loving John, in his visions of the future. No wonder that they cried, as if impatient of delay: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, wilt thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth!" — Rev. 6 : 10.

This tremendous power is represented, in Rev. 17 : 18, by the Babylonian harlot, and mother of harlots and abominations. A truer picture was never drawn. Such a combination of complicated, refined, varied and heaven-daring wickedness, never met before in the same connection. It is unparalleled for its gross slanders of the good, for its bloody and cruel persecutions, for its wilful perversions of the Scriptures and of the facts of history, for its arrogant pretensions, and its boundless hypocrisy and infidelity.

But destruction from the Almighty is decreed against it. That decree is written out, plain and clear, in the word of God. He that runs may read. The child and the fool almost may understand. The axe is even now at the root of the tree, to cut it down. The lightnings of heaven are beginning to scathe its branches. Sinners in Zion are afraid, and fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrite. The storm lowers that is ready to break down her battlements. The earthquake begins its rumbling and muttering thunders, which is ready to bury them in undistinguished ruin. But a little respite is given for God's faithful ones to become aware of their criminal and dangerous connections, and flee for safety to the arms of their mighty Saviour. And a voice from heaven is crying: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached to heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." — Rev. 18 : 4, 5.

The Papal church has gone into boundless efforts to build itself up, and to glorify its hierarchy; and what has it gained? It has gained nothing worth possessing. But what has it lost? It has lost the greatest opportunities of usefulness, and of the attainment of an exalted excellence and moral worth, that have ever been lavished upon the world.

A great loss was sustained by humanity when God's ancient people apostatized, and resorted to the beggarly elements of the world for glory and happiness. They brought overwhelming calamities upon themselves; they lost opportunities of performing infinite service for others. But, when the Christian church apostatized, the loss to all parties was infinitely greater, in proportion to the greater excellence of the Christian scheme of church organization and holy living, compared with that of the Jews.

The mark of Cain and Judas is placed on the forehead of the Papal hierarchy. There is a lie in its right hand; its whole system is built on lies; and its fruits are the apples of Sodom and clusters of Gomorrah.

It is the great enemy of true religion; the enemy of the uni-

versal diffusion of knowledge; the enemy of the Bible even, and its general diffusion; the slanderer of republicans and republican institutions; the patron of puerile superstition, of ignorance, of hypocrisy, and of wickedness in every form. The Papal system tends as directly to degrade and debase its ministry, as if it had been instituted for that express purpose.

Its first requisition of them is, the relinquishment of all just and reasonable liberty, and the submission and subservience of a slave. The Papal hierarchy not only enslaves its subjects; it enslaves the rulers also, and subjects them to a more degrading slavery than that of the laity. They must give up everything; they must lay down everything; they must sacrifice everything; not at the demand of God, nor to meet any great exigences of suffering humanity, but at the professed command of the church, and the real command of the supreme head of the hierarchy, the Pope. The candidate for preferment must make the hierarchy, under the name of the church, his God; at its command he must believe the incredible, and attempt the impossible, and practise the idolatrous and impious.

The hierarchy is in the condition of a man that set a trap for his neighbor and directly is caught in it himself. It has gone into a scheme to enslave the entire world, to bind it hand and foot, and lay it blindfold, if not with all its powers of vision extinguished, at the feet of a relentless and merciless spiritual despotism; but is itself caught in its own toils, and reduced to the meanest subjection.

The Papal church has never favored free inquiry and unlimited freedom of opinion. It has never favored the general circulation of the Bible, and the study of the word of God by the entire people. It proscribes the works of many of the most eminent men of modern times, and does not allow them to be read by its membership.

It observes a great many fasts and religious festivals, but allows its members in a very negligent observance of the Sabbath.

Yet there are many good people in this Babylon, many sincere and earnest Christians; and the principal doctrines of Christianity are all taught in its approved books and in its pulpits. Some of its ministers have, in all ages, been the lights of their times, and the benefactors of their race; and the annals of its missionaries contain some of the brightest examples of Christian heroism that the world contains.

Alas, that so much good, and so much of the glorious, should be mixed with so much evil! Its system of despotism is its fundamental sin; and will, ultimately, prove its ruin. It is not fit that fallible and erring men should be invested with unlimited power. With the best intentions, they are liable to commit great errors. And their intentions cannot always be depended upon to be the best.

This is the case with the Catholic hierarchy. They have usurped greater powers than they know how to use. In a dark age, and in an evil day, they have adopted a system of despotism which only the Creator is competent to exercise with safety. They have aspired above the medium of man's capacities, and they must recede to lower and safer ground. The prerogatives of God must be left to himself alone. He tells us to call no man master, for one is our Master in heaven. We easily infer, therefore, that no man, and no body of men, under any pretext whatever, may assume to be called master, and to exercise lordship over their fellow-men.

The actual working of the Papacy is the most extended and conclusive demonstration of the *inexpediency* of despotism that the world has ever seen; and is destined to open the eyes of the world, not excepting Catholics themselves, to the essential viciousness of the system.

Many think that despotism is very well, if it is only exercised right. They do not object to it, either in church or state. They only object to the abuse of it. That is the difficulty; if it is only exercised right, it is well indeed. Man is not fit to be an irresponsible master of his fellow-man. His natural and moral

qualifications are both inadequate to the demands of that office. Men cannot be intrusted with an unlimited authority over their children, much as they generally love them. Such authority would often be abused; sometimes intentionally, sometimes unintentionally. And children, when they arrive at a proper age, are intrusted with the general direction of their own affairs. They are not always under tutors and governors.

What is true in respect to personal and individual liberty, is true of the liberties of communities, and of all communities, civil and religious. No community ought to have unnecessary restrictions laid on its liberties. Every civil community ought, as far as may consist with the general good, to have the regulation and direction of its own affairs. It knows best, as a general rule, how to order them. It has the highest interest in ordering them right, and the most to lose by ordering them wrong. So of spiritual communities. Every spiritual community ought to have the greatest possible liberty to order its own spiritual concerns and interests. It ought to admit no masters over it, because none can understand its interests, all in all, as well as itself; and they cannot be as important to a master as to itself.

It is one of the results of the Papacy to *prevent* the greatest possible elevation, dignity and prosperity, of its subjects, instead of promoting them. By repressing a spirit of free inquiry in religion, by abridging unnecessarily the liberties both of the local church and the individual church-member, by encouraging gloomy superstitions, and accustoming its subjects to accept the plausible for the real, the traditionary for the authentic and well supported, and by denying the right and competency of the judgment of individuals in religious matters, it interposes a barrier between the subject and his God, and holds him back from the independent and resolute exercise of his faculties to such a degree, as, in many cases, to do him great injury. Taught that he cannot be more than a child, he does not attempt to be the man he might and ought to be, and accordingly is not.

The highest possible dignity of human nature is only to be

attained under a system of liberty and independence. God favors this, and makes it the greatest possible. The Pope abridges it, and so does the civil and military despot, and makes it the most limited possible. Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-American energy and elevation of character never could have existed under the universal and unrestricted reign of Popery, or of civil despotism. They are the growth of liberty in church and state; and are among its noblest products.

PART IV.

REVOLUTIONARY CHURCHES.

The principal of the modern revolutionary churches may be comprehended under the following divisions:

1. The Consistorial. 2. The Episcopal. 3. The Presbyterian. 4. The Congregational.

The Lutheran churches of Germany are principally consistorial.

1, The church of England; 2, The Protestant Episcopal church of the United States; and, 3, The Methodist Episcopal churches, are episcopal.

The Presbyterian and Congregational churches embrace numerous ecclesiastical bodies, called by different names, which agree in the adoption of their polities respectively. Most of these churches had their origin in the great Protestant reformation, in Germany, in the sixteenth century. Congregationalism has sprung up since. But all are based on revolutionary principles. They are reörganizations and secessions from the Papal church; and, of course, cannot derive from it, or through it, any of their prerogatives and powers.

A seceding state may establish for itself new authority; but it cannot derive any authority whatever from the state departed from. Seceders from independent societies may establish new and other independent societies, but they cannot derive any powers whatever from the societies which they leave.

It is so with the churches which originated in the Protestant

reformation, and which have been organized since. They are out of the succession and out of the communion of the Papal church, and derive from it, and through it, no powers and no authority whatever. Whatever authority and whatever powers they have, they must create and base on revolutionary principles. An attempt has been made by the Episcopal churches to derive their powers from the Papal church, on the principle of an orderly succession and transmission of authority. But, to have any validity in this claim, they must desist from their rebellion and secession, and come into the communion of the Papal church. The branch must belong to the vine, in order to derive support from it; and churches which wish to derive any powers whatever from the Papal church, or through it, must belong to it. The Papal church gives no authority to seceders or schismatics. They may have been in its communion; their ministers may have been ordained by its bishops, and may have officiated by its authority; but, when they secede and rebel, they are excommunicated, and all their powers taken from them. Their ordination is no longer of any effect; they are deposed from the ministry, as heretics and schismatics, and no longer have any authority to minister from their previous ordination. The Episcopal orders, and others, are in the same predicament. They can derive no powers for their organization generally, nor for their ministers in particular, from the Papal church. Their bishops are as destitute of any powers, derived from the Papal church, to officiate as Christian bishops, after their deposition and excommunication by the Papal authorities, as if they had never been ordained. The doctrine of apostolical succession, therefore, in Protestant churches, and in all modern churches not in communion with some of the ancient churches, is entirely unfounded, and ought not to command the confidence of a child.

Whence, then, do the Protestant churches derive their authority? And have they any valid authority to act as churches? And whence do the Protestant ministers derive *their* authority? And have they any valid authority to act as ministers?

Protestant churches derive their authority from the consent of the members. They cannot be formed without the consent of members to be organized as a church, and to submit to authority and government of some kind. That consent is the source of their authority; and the authority itself is determined by the consent which gives it birth. This is true, both in respect to the form of the government, and the number and extent of the requirements to be obeyed. If members consent to be governed on Episcopal principles, that consent leads to the creation of an Episcopal government; if they consent to be governed on Presbyterian principles, it gives rise to a Presbyterian government; if they consent to be governed on Congregational principles, it gives rise to a Congregational or democratic government. The church creates its ministry, and is the source, under God, of its powers.

The amount of authority conferred on the rulers, as well as its kind, depends on the consent of the membership. It is greater or less, as they consent to have it greater or less.

It makes no difference whether this consent is given formally or informally. It is enough to have it given. It may be embodied in written constitutions, or it may be an unwritten verbal agreement, or only an understanding. The consent of the membership is the source of authority to the church as a body, and to the ministry; and this is equally true with all systems of church polity, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational. This, and not tradition, is the true source of all the valid authority of the Papacy itself. The Papal power is, in a sense, traditionary, but is, in effect, by consent of the membership.

The authority of the ministry thus constituted is a valid authority. The church, by its consent, authorizes its ministry to perform for it, and for all the world, as far as may be in its power, all the appropriate offices of the ministry. The membership do this in the name of God, for his glory, in obedience to their sense of duty, and, as they believe, in conformity with God's word and will. Does God sanction their procedure?

Does he ratify their ordinations? does he set the seal of his approbation to their doings?

He does not approve or condemn their procedure by any supernatural communication, or voice from heaven. He cannot be expected to do so. One method of signifying his pleasure and approbation is by bestowing his blessing, and a corresponding method of signifying his displeasure is by inflicting divine judgments.

He blessed his faithful and obedient people in ancient times, and inflicted divine judgments on his disobedient people. The revolutionary churches of Protestant Christendom have many of them been greatly blessed, and have been made great blessings to the world. No great providential calamities have befallen them, more than the church from which they seceded. Their members, and the communities in which they exist, are among the most favored and the most prosperous of the human race. They are at the head of human affairs, controlling the destinies of the world. Piety and virtue, with all their blessed fruits of peace, love and happiness, prevail among them. Yet, piety and virtue do not exist without the Spirit of God. The fruits of the spirit are, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, and the other virtues. With God, we can do all things; without him, we can do nothing. Protestant Christendom is the brightest, richest, and most powerful and happiest portion of the world, at this moment.

But this is not all. Christianity originated in a revolutionary procedure. A divinely-appointed organization was in existence, and had come down from ages long past. That organization had become corrupt, and had set itself against some of the leading principles of Christianity. Still it held to much that was good. It read Moses and the prophets, and called God its father and sovereign.

The first Christians came out from this organization, and organized anew, leaving out the unbelieving. No sooner was the new organization completed, and in a condition to meet the exigences of the world, than God brought on the Roman armies

and destroyed his ancient people. Judaism went down under the divine judgments, and Christianity went up, in the enjoyment of the divine mercies.

The principle of revolution in religion is necessary to preserve the church from corruption. This necessity is as great in the church as in the state, and arises from similar causes. If the state does not answer its legitimate ends, in respect to any country or province, and cannot be made to do so; and if, instead of answering its legitimate ends of good, it is the cause of evil, the people of that country or province have a natural right, founded in expediency, to form a new state, on better principles, if they can. Our fathers did so in the revolution of 1776. Other nations have done so, in different ages; and the rectitude of this procedure is generally admitted.

On the same principle, reörganization is imperatively demanded in the church, when that institution fails to answer its legitimate purposes, and when it cannot be reformed. This was the condition of the Papal church at the time of the Protestant reformation, and it is its condition still. It does not answer its legitimate ends of the promotion of holiness. It cannot be reformed. Those, therefore, that perceive its corruptions have no course left them but to withdraw from its communion and organize anew, or join some organizations already commenced.

We conclude, therefore, that the right of revolutionism and reörganization in the church is clearly conformable to the principles of Christianity; and is not only a right that may, in certain circumstances, be exercised, but one that *must* be exercised.

God must be worshipped; the church must be preserved in its purity; piety and virtue among men must be promoted by church organic action; and, if traditionary organizations do not accomplish these objects, revolutionary ones must.

God demands not obedience to the church, except *in the Lord;* nor does he sanction or legitimate church oppression or cor-

ruption. As far as the church enjoins God's injunctions, its laws are valid, and entitled to obedience. Whenever it transcends its legitimate powers, and enjoins what God forbids, or forbids what God enjoins, its laws are null and void.

The requirement to obey God in all things, and to carry out in the church the principles of his word, implies the right and obligation to reörganize churches whenever and wherever obedience, and the full execution of the laws of Christ in the church, demand such measures, and cannot be accomplished without them.

God might have made the right of revolutionism in the church a matter of express precept. He might have done the same with regard to the similar right in the state. But the most explicit precepts could not have made them clearer and more certain than they now are.

DIVISION I.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

PRECURSORS OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

In the fourteenth century the Papal church was at the zenith of its power and glory. The Pope was an earthly lord of lords and king of kings; and the whole earth, almost, was given into his hands, and subjected to his dominion. The world had never seen such a power before; so august, so sacred, so skilful, so complete and perfect in its arrangements for the accomplishment of its purposes, and so absolute. All Central and Western Europe was at his feet, and kissed the very dust he trod upon.

He crowned sovereigns and deposed them, at his pleasure. He absolved subjects from their allegiance to such sovereigns as displeased him, sold indulgences to sin, and caused all that opposed his will to be extirpated with fire and sword.

But, during the dark period from 606 till the commencement of the reformation, Oct. 31, 1517, by Luther, God had not wanted witnesses to testify against the general corruption of religion.

The Albigenses and Waldenses, in the south-east of France and the north-west of Italy, protested against the general corruption, in the early part of the thirteenth century, and were destroyed by many ten thousands, in exterminating wars, and by inquisitorial torments. In the fourteenth century, Wickliffe, the morning star of the reformation, arose in England, and executed the first English translation of the Bible. He protested loudly against the principal errors and oppressions of Popery. The council of Constance condemned his opinions, A. D. 1415; and in 1428, forty-one years after his death, his remains were dug up and publicly burnt. His followers were numerous in England and on the continent, and were cruelly persecuted.

In the fifteenth century, John Huss, professor of theology at the university of Prague in Bohemia, adopted the views of Wickliffe, and excited a powerful anti-Papal movement in that country; for which he received the crown of martyrdom, and perished at the stake, by the authority of the Roman Catholic council of Constance, July 6, 1415. The same honor was conferred on his generous and noble friend, Jerome of Prague, on the 30th of May, 1416.

Bright and beautiful names, embalmed with the tears and enshrined in the hearts of millions!

In the mean time the spirit of discontent was everywhere abroad, and with it a spirit of scepticism and inquiry. The inquisitorial dungeons were kept constantly filled, and the fires of persecution constantly burning. Inquisitors were multiplied almost *ad infinitum*, and their faithfulness stimulated by distin-

guished honors and emoluments. There was no safety to the honest inquirer after truth, either when he went out or when he came in. Hired informers watched him in public, and hired spies pursued him secretly to his most retired closets of study and devotion. Domestics informed against their employers, and relations and connections against their friends. The husband was not secure from accusation by the wife of his bosom, nor the wife by her husband; and, in multitudes of cases, to be accused and informed against, was to be condemned and executed, often with inhuman tortures. Thousands perished in the secret dungeons of the inquisition, and by private executions; and thousands perished in open day, spectacles to men as well as angels.

Such a persecuting power as the Roman Catholic church was at this time is without parallel in the history of the world. Pharaoh, Herod, Nero, Caligula, and all the monsters of ancient cruelty, dwindled into pigmies by the side of this spiritual Babylonian harlot.

But the system was permitted to develop itself fully, and to work out its legitimate results, as if to lay a foundation for its more utter destruction, and to furnish a more effectual warning against all future apostasies.

But God was preparing himself and his people for the great battle of ages. The crusades of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries had given an impulse to the cause of learning; the invention of the mariner's compass, in the fourteenth century, had given an impulse to navigation, commerce and manufactures; the invention of printing, in 1450, had opened new and inexhaustible resources for the diffusion and advancement of knowledge; and, finally, the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, in 1492, with other less important discoveries, prepared the way for a new and mighty movement of the human mind, in respect to religion and the liberties of the human race.

Having prepared everything for his work, God introduced Martin Luther upon the stage of Germany; the only field where,

at that time, his labors could have had full effect, and made him the great instrument of the Protestant reformation.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISE OF LUTHERANISM.

Martin Luther, the prime mover of the great Protestant reformation of Germany, in the sixteenth century, was born at Eisleben, Nov. 10, 1483. In his boyhood he obtained his support at school, as many other poor scholars did at that time, at the doors of the more wealthy inhabitants in the vicinity of the institution in which he studied; but, at a later period, he was taken under the care of a maternal relation, who provided for his support. In 1501 he entered the university at Erfurt, and received the degree of master in 1503, at the age of twenty. About this time he discovered a Bible in the library of the university, and commenced the study of it. This circumstance led to his studying for the ministry, though his original destination by his father, had been for the law.

Contrary to the wishes of his father, he entered the monastery of the Augustine monks at Erfurt, in 1505, at twenty-two years of age, and submitted to the rules of that order. He was made a priest in 1507, and a professor of philosophy in the new university of Wittemburg, in 1508. Here he began to discover and assert the rights of human reason against the despotism of tradition and the church.

In 1510 he visited Rome on business of his order, and was amazed at the corruption and impiety that he found there. In 1512 he was made a doctor of theology. He had become eminently learned in the Scriptures, and powerfully impressed with

a sense of their value as a standard of Christian faith and practice, and an instrument of general instruction.

In 1517 he opposed the sale of indulgences, in the most public and determined manner, by maintaining ninety-five public propositions against them.

His propositions were condemned as heretical, and, after a variety of ineffectual endeavors to bring him to submission to the Holy See, he was summoned to Rome, to answer for his heresies and other offences against the church. He refused to obey this summons, and continued his attacks on the most vital doctrines of the Papal system, particularly that of the *supremacy of the Pope.*

After appealing in vain from the Pope and his legate to a general council, he was excommunicated from the church, together with his friends, in 1520, and his writings were publicly burnt at Rome, Cologne and Louvaine. Luther answered this by burning the Pope's bull of excommunication, together with the decretals of the Papal canon of Wittemburg, Dec. 10, 1520.

He became from this time an object of the most intense interest, both to friends and foes. His attitude was one of great boldness and daring, and his enemies numerous and powerful, the principal of whom were the Pope Leo X., and Charles V., emperor of Germany. But he had also powerful friends among the princes of Germany, and, most of all, his God was his fortress and his high tower.

He took his stand on the Scriptures, and contended for Christianity as it was left by Christ and the apostles, denouncing the corruptions of the Papacy in the most unmeasured terms.

In 1521, at the summons of the emperor Charles V., he attended the diet at Worms, and defended his doctrines before the emperor, the archduke Ferdinand, six electors, twenty-four dukes, seven margraves, thirty bishops and prelates, and many other princes, counts, lords and ambassadors, and defied a refutation from the Scriptures.

On the excommunication of himself and his adherents by the

Pope, in 1520, Luther laid the foundation of the connection which has since borne his name, and which speedily became one of the largest and most important churches of the Protestant reformation of the sixteenth century.

He died at Eisleben, his native place, February 18, 1546, aged 63.

The celebrated protest of the princes of Germany favorable to the reformation, against the reëstablishment of the Papacy, was made April 19, 1529.

Luther reformed his church by lopping off the offensive additions of the Papacy and Papal corruption, and leaving the rest. With other things that he left, was a modified and extremely moderate Episcopacy. His Episcopacy, however, is a near approximation to Presbyterianism, except in Sweden and Denmark, where the different orders of the ministry are more marked, and titular distinctions, as well as offices of different grades, are maintained.

The temporal sovereigns of Europe, however, assumed the supreme control of ecclesiastical affairs, and govern the Lutheran churches of their respective domininions by consistories, or church courts, composed of civil and ecclesiastical jurists; the civil jurists appointed by themselves, the ecclesiastical by the church.

The church uses liturgies, and each country has its own liturgical service. The festivals of the Lutheran church are similar to those of the church of England and the Episcopal church of the United States.

CHAPTER III.

THE LUTHERAN SYSTEM OF CHURCH POLITY.

The Lutheran system of church government is sometimes distinguished from others under the title of the Consistorial System. At the time of the Protestant reformation, it was the common doctrine of the Protestant sovereigns that the sovereign was entitled to administer the affairs of the church equally with those of the state.

Luther's great doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers naturally required that the entire membership should participate in the functions of church government. But circumstances led him practically to exalt the power of the magistrate, and of the clerical body, and to neglect the representation of the membership, in church courts. The same policy was pursued by his successors; and, instead of a government emanating from the membership, or allowing them a controlling voice in church matters, the Lutheran churches received a government of consistories appointed by the sovereign, and subject to his supervision, making the head of the state the head of the church; and not only so, but making him its absolute master and spiritual sovereign.

So that the great enemy and assailant of the Papacy, as a system of spiritual despotism, has in effect set up only modified systems of the same despotic polity; and the great battle of religious liberty and church government by the membership has been required to be fought and gained over again, by other champions and in other countries.

The secular sovereigns, being recognized as heads of the Lutheran churches in their dominions, have governed them by

consistories or courts, consisting of some eight, ten or twenty assessors, clergymen and laymen, associated in nearly equal proportions. In some cases adherents of the Papacy have been eligible to these courts.

These consistories have been subordinated to a minister of the crown, who has had a veto on their proceedings; and their decisions have been subject to an appeal to the sovereign.

Besides, the consistories have been mostly restricted to the internal and administrative government of the church, as the superintendence of public worship, the ordination of ministers, examination and approval of candidates for the ministry, &c.; while the whole business of legislating on the subject of church interests and duties has, in many cases, been assumed by the state.

The district and general superintendents, whose business it has been to carry out the decrees of the consistories, in the ordination of ministers, and in other spiritual matters, have received their appointment from the sovereign, giving him every possible advantage for securing the most absolute control of all church matters, and leaving the ministry and the membership almost as much in the hands of the state sovereign, as the clergy and laity of the Papal church are in those of the Pope.

That great abuses should occur under such a system, was a matter of course. The church of Christ became an adjunct of the state, and its lucrative offices prizes to be distributed by the government to its friends, and to the supporters of its cherished schemes and favorite measures. Under this system scriptural discipline was impossible, and corruption, in doctrine and practice, came in like a flood.

The rights of the membership, in respect to any influential voice in church matters, were annihilated. They might attend public worship, and receive the ordinances of the church, and purchase, at a fixed government price, certain prescribed services from their clergyman; and they might serve as church-wardens, this board in some cases being appointed by the higher church

authorities, and in others appointing its coässessors. But these wardens had only a shadow of authority, and exerted no influence whatever in settling any great questions of church doctrine or discipline.

Throughout Germany the different civil governments monopolize the whole departments of church legislation and superintendence, with that of the church judiciary and supreme executive. A result of this state-church despotism is, that the church is made a dependent and subordinate of the state, and, like the Papal church, the subject of unbounded conservatism, in favor of civil and church despotism. There is much dissatisfaction with this church despotism in Germany, and it seems destined to pass away. A revolution in favor of republicanism would overthrow it in a single year, almost in a day.

The Presbyterian churches of Germany, though in less abject dependence on the state, are only allowed a limited church jurisdiction. Besides, Germany is the theatre of territorialism, in respect to different church orders. Her churches are all state churches, and are generally exclusive within prescribed territorial limits. Different orders exist side by side in adjacent territories, but not generally in the same territory.

Entire freedom of church organization, the triumph of religious liberty in England and the United States, has not been attained in Germany.

The government of the Lutheran churches has been essentially improved, in the United States, by being relieved from all state interference. In Germany, and in other European countries, it is considerably different in different kingdoms and principalities.

The whole number of Lutherans is estimated as follows:

In Germany,	35,000,000
Prussia,	5,000,000
Sweden,	3,000,000
United States,	1,000,000
Total,	44,000,000

In 1848, there was established a general convention of the Lutheran and Presbyterian churches in Germany, which meets annually, deliberates and gives advice in all church matters of general concern, and presides as an advisory council over German Christianity. Out of this has already grown, in 1852, the general conference of the German church rulers, in which the supreme consistories and ruling church boards have a representation by delegates. This conference had its first meeting in 1852, at Eisenach.

A journal has been instituted as the organ of this conference, containing the records of its proceedings, and publishing important papers that are brought before it.

Being scattered through more than thirty states and principalities, and having been heretofore without any visible bond of union and coöperation under different civil governments, these general associations promise highly valuable results.

The alliance of the German churches with the state, and their subjection to the supreme control of the state sovereigns, has operated much to the injury of the cause of the Protestant reformation in that country. It left the reformation incomplete, and deprived the church of power to complete it. It has often been a matter of surprise that so much should have been gained in Germany during the life of Luther, and immediately after his death, and that so little should have been added to those gains during the three centuries which have followed. But this is fully accounted for by the unfortunate church polity to which the fruits of the Lutheran reformation were consigned.

Lutheranism, in respect to church polity, was but a modification of the Papacy. It substituted the temporal sovereign for the Pope, greatly simplified the ritual of divine service, and improved the generally accredited standards of theology and morality. But it left each state and principality church a modified Popedom, as much under the dominion of the temporal sovereign, almost, as the Roman Catholic church is under that of the Pope. It reversed another error of the Papacy. The

Papacy had endeavored to make the state subject to the church, and the civil power subordinate to the ecclesiastical; the German constitutions made the church subordinate to the state, and the ecclesiastical power subordinate to the civil. Under these disabilities, it has been impossible for the Protestant reformation to advance rapidly towards perfection in Germany; and it is not strange that rationalism and religious scepticism should have made great inroads on establishments so constituted. It is, rather, strange that piety and Christian knowledge should have prevailed to any considerable extent under such disadvantages.

It was undoubtedly a great error of the German reformers that they did not stipulate for the entire independence of their churches, and that they did not organize them on the apostolic model in this respect. And, if anything was wanting to demonstrate the inexpediency of this departure from the original principles and usages of Christianity, the experience and fortunes of the German churches for the last three hundred years furnish arguments to complete that demonstration.

The German churches have not had a proper liberty of development, and piety and Christian knowledge have both languished under their administration. The entire German character has suffered by this means; and, in consequence mainly of better church organizations, the Anglo-Saxons have been enabled to outstrip them in the race of improvement and general prosperity.

The false position of the church in Germany with respect to the state has operated greatly to the detriment of true religion in that country, and has been the occasion of much rationalism and infidelity. Metaphysics have run wild, and the most extravagant hypotheses respecting the great fundamental questions of moral and intellectual philosophy have been proposed, advocated and extensively received, in that country. Infidelity, in its various forms, has had numerous and learned advocates; and Phrenology and Mesmerism have been disseminated extensively through the world by German speculators.

But, at the same time, this country has led the world in its devotion to sound classical learning, and occupies the highest rank in the departments of sacred literature, both Greek and Hebrew. The services of the German Lutherans in the cause of sacred literature are immense and invaluable. Their master scholars and critics are the teachers and leaders of the learned of all other nations. England and America are left *far behind* in this department of literary labors. Both, however, are coming on; and the day is not far distant when American scholarship in sacred learning will not allow itself to be outstripped by that of any other country in the world. The great seminaries of sacred learning in Germany are the German universities. Those of America are the theological seminaries.

Had the Lutheran church received its independence of the state, and reverted fully to the church democracy of the apostles in its ecclesiastical organizations, its light might have been far more brilliant, and its services far greater, than they now are. The exaltation of the membership to their highest dignity and glory is not practicable on any other plan. On this plan it is entirely practicable.

The transcendent powers of Christianity are restrained and withheld from their proper exercise by every element of despotism which is introduced into its organization, and every departure from the divine plan. The church suffers, and piety and virtue are less predominant among its members, for all errors of this kind. Nor is this all. The state suffers in all its interests of wealth, learning and true refinement, by the same means. The church in its greatest purity and power is proportionably the most useful ally and servant of the state. The perfect renovation of the Lutheran church, if it could be effected at this moment, would be a greater temporal blessing to the states of Germany, than all the mines of Australia and California transferred to her mountains, or their products deposited in her vaults.

DIVISION II.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The church of England is a fragment broken off from the Papal despotism, and erected into an independent national establishment. This schism occurred under Henry VIII., and was brought about by his means. It is one of the most remarkable events in history.

Arthur, prince of Wales, son of Henry VII., having espoused Catharine of Arragon, fourth daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, and dying six months afterwards, his brother, subsequently Henry VIII., accepted the hand of the widow, while his sister Margaret, eldest daughter of Henry VII., married James IV. of Scotland, and transmitted the rights of her descendants to the Stuarts, ultimately raising that family to the throne of England.

Henry VIII. succeeded his father in 1509, at the age of eighteen; made the celebrated Cardinal Wolsey his prime minister; and, possessing abundant resources secured by the parsimony of his father, commenced his reign by indulging in great dissipation, and giving loose reins to his pleasures. Cardinal Wolsey flattered and humored him in his vices, and endeavored to profit by them to secure his own greater elevation and power.

The attention of Henry was engaged by war and diplomacy in turn; and, indignant at the successes of Luther, and the gen-

eral interest that was excited throughout Europe by his labors, he entered the lists against him as a champion of the Catholic church. He composed a treatise in defence of the seven sacraments, which was honored by the Pope as fit to rank with the learned and pious treatises of Jerome and Augustine, and for which he received from his holiness the title of the Defender of the Faith. This title is still retained by the English sovereigns, and is an excellent specimen of the absurdity and irregularity with which honorary titles are usually conferred.

In 1527, Henry became enamored of Anne Boleyn, one of the queen's maids-of-honor, and early formed the design of getting rid of his wife and marrying this new favorite. Embracing a favorable opportunity, when the Pope, Clement VII., had a difference with Charles V., emperor of Germany and Catharine's nephew, Henry requested that his existing marriage with Catharine might be annulled. He had *serious scruples* about its lawfulness, and considered it a violation of the law of Leviticus on the subject. To enlighten the Pope with respect to the law of marriage, the king sent him an original treatise on it, in support of his request. But the Pope had doubts; and, being pressed by Charles V. on one side, and Henry VIII. on the other, was in a strait between the two.

Anxious not to disoblige Henry, and not to offend Charles, he temporized, and found means to delay deciding on the subject, in the hope that the king might change his mind, and overcome his scruples with respect to the lawfulness of his then existing connection.

Henry, irritated by this delay, banished the unfortunate Catharine from his court in 1529, after which the further consideration of his case was transferred from England, where it had been taken up by Papal legate, to Rome. The king was so angry at this that he degraded Cardinal Wolsey, his prime minister and confidential adviser, from his offices, stripped him of his property, and overwhelmed him with disgrace, so that he died the next year, 1530, of a broken heart.

Cranmer, favorable to the reformation, was called to occupy the place of Cardinal Wolsey; and the king, after obtaining from a majority of the principal universities of Europe opinions favorable to his wishes, charged the entire body of the Papal clergy with conspiring against him, and claimed the right to confiscate their vast property and subject them to imprisonment on account of this conspiracy, according to a law on the subject, giving him such power. A convocation was immediately called, and a hundred thousand pounds offered him for a full pardon. He refused to accept it, unless the clergy would acknowledge him supreme head of the church in England. This they did. In this way he obtained the consent of the clergy to acknowledge his supremacy in the church in England.

He then raised Cranmer to be archbishop of Canterbury, obtained from him a divorce from Catharine, had the Papal authority in England formally annulled by parliament, and himself declared supreme head of the English church, with most of the spiritual prerogatives previously of the Pope.

He did not intend to change the church establishment essentially, except to install himself in the office of its Pope, or supreme head.

He, however, regarded the religious orders as his implacable enemies, and took decisive measures to reduce and humble them.

In the mean time, he became disaffected with Anne Boleyn, his new wife; had her suddenly arrested, conveyed to the Tower, and in seventeen days condemned and executed for adultery. The next day he married Jane Seymour, one of her maids-of-honor. During these changes, great religious discontent was excited, several revolts broke out, and thirty thousand malcontents marched from the north of England towards London, with a view to effect a revolution against the king. These rebels, however, were dispersed, and their principal leaders executed. The monks were accused of being secret instigators of this rebellion, and the king determined to crush them entirely, and destroy their religious communities. Parliament passed the necessary measures, and

the principal religious orders were broken up, and their estates seized by the crown, to the amount of a hundred and sixty thousand pounds.

Amidst all these violent proceedings, Henry was a violent and intolerant defender of the principal errors of the church of Rome.

Under his successors, the church of England experienced a variety of fortunes. In 1554 the Roman Catholic system was reëstablished as the religion of the nation, and attempted to be enforced by a bloody persecution, in which three hundred of the anti-Papal party were burned at the stake, including archbishop Cranmer, and bishops Latimer, Hooper and Ridley; but, on Mary's death and the accession of Elizabeth, Protestantism was reëstablished; without any considerable change, however, in the polity of the church, except that the offices and prerogatives of the Pope devolved on the sovereign.

Episcopacy was abolished in 1643, and Presbyterianism adopted in its place, and partially introduced. The state of things continued unsettled during the civil war with Charles I. and the protectorate of Cromwell. But, at the accession of Charles II., Episcopacy was again reëstablished, with the prohibition of dissent. This continued till the revolution of 1688, which brought William, prince of Orange, to the throne, when a more tolerant policy was pursued with regard to dissent, and dissenting orders allowed.

Some important reforms have been effected in the church of England; but, for the most part, it retains the polity which it had under Henry VIII., and while under the Papal hierarchy.

The government of the church of England is episcopal. It cuts off from the Papal system the Pope, substituting in his place the sovereign of the country, with less ample powers; and also cuts off the religious orders and monastic establishments. These are very great improvements, but they are far from bringing the church back to the primitive apostolic organization. It is constituted after the Roman Catholic model, and might very

properly be called the English Catholic church, in distinction from the Roman Catholic. It is a national church; and is in theory meant to be the only church of the nation.

Its only difference in theory from the Papal church is, that the latter is designed to be the catholic church of the world, while the former is designed to be the catholic church of England.

CHAPTER II.

OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The King or Queen.

The king, and, in case that a female is the reigning sovereign, the queen, is the supreme head of the church of England, and governs it by archbishops, bishops and presbyters. The king is the virtual Pope or super-archbishop of the English church, and has the supreme control of its affairs. He convenes, prorogues and regulates the general synods or convocations, nominates candidates for vacant bishoprics and certain other ecclesiastical preferments, and receives and issues appeals from all the inferior ecclesiastical courts. Appeals from the archbishops' court to the king are tried by judges whom the king appoints for the purpose, and who are called court delegates. These judges are appointed from the judges of the courts of Westminster and doctors of the civil law, together with several spiritual and temporal lords, in greater or less number, according to the pleasure of the king.

When the king is a party to any ecclesiastical suit, the appeal does not lie to him, as he could not with propriety be made a judge in his own case, but to all the bishops in the kingdom, assembled in the upper house of convocation.

In extraordinary cases the decision of the court of delegates may be revised by a commission of review. The king grants

such a commission, according to his discretion, when he apprehends that the court of delegates have been led into a material error. In this respect he follows the example of the Pope. These grants, however, are matters of favor, not of right.

Archbishops.

In the church of England there are two archbishops, the archbishop of Canterbury and the archbishop of York. They are elected by the chapters of their cathedral churches, by virtue of a license from the king proposing the candidate to be elected. The king has the exclusive right of proposing candidates for these offices. The chapter or electoral college, therefore, has only a negative power in respect to this election. It can reject a candidate, but it cannot propose one. If the chapter delays the election more than twelve days, the king may appoint any person whom he pleases to this office, by letters-patent. This appointment, when made by the king, must be signified to the other archbishop and two bishops, or to four bishops, requiring them to confirm, invest and consecrate, the person so appointed; which they are bound to do.

The archbishops are the spiritual rulers of their respective provinces. England is divided into two archepiscopal provinces, under its two archbishops. The province of Canterbury contains twenty-one dioceses; that of York, four. Besides their archepiscopal functions, the archbishops are themselves bishops each of a single diocese, in which they perform the duties of other bishops. In their provinces they have power to assemble the provincial synods, on the receipt of the king's writ for that purpose, and to preside in the same.

The archbishop receives appeals from the bishops, and, during the vacancy of any diocese in his province, has charge of its spiritualities, its temporalities devolving on the king. He is entitled to the incomes of all the ecclesiastical livings at the disposal of his diocesan bishops which are not filled in six months, and has a customary prerogative, when he consecrates a bishop,

to receive a living from him for a clergyman of his own. In the place of this, he often receives, by deed, the right of the next presentation of such dignity or benefice, in the bishop's disposal, as he may choose.

The archbishop holds courts of appeal, in which his principal official acts as judge, and receives and determines appeals from the sentences of all the inferior ecclesiastical courts.

The archbishop of Canterbury is termed primate of all England, and is the first peer of the realm. He takes precedence of all the nobility, except of the blood royal, and of all the great officers of state. Next to him is the archbishop of York. The archbishop of Canterbury crowns the kings and queens of England, and the archbishop of York the queen-consort. The first archbishop of Canterbury was the celebrated missionary-monk Augustin, previously abbot of St. Andrews, at Rome. He was appointed to the archepiscopal office, by Pope Gregory the Great. A. D. 598. The first archbishop of York was appointed A. D. 622.

Bishops.

Bishops, in the church of England, are next in rank to the archbishops, and are elected, like them, by virtue of a special license from the king, proposing the candidate. Their election is by episcopal chapters, as in the case of the archbishops. They receive consecration from the archbishop. The bishops of the provinces of Canterbury and York, with the exception of the bishop of Sodor and Man, are spiritual lords, and occupy seats in the House of Lords, as such. The secular aristocracy, in distinction from the spiritual, are denominated temporal lords.

The bishop of London takes precedence of the other bishops. Next to him is the bishop of Durham; the third in rank is the bishop of Winchester. The rest take rank according to the seniority of their consecration.

The bishop's district is denominated his diocese, and his church the cathedral. The clergy who officiate in the cathedrals are

denominated canons and prebendaries, and are supported by funds set apart for the purpose. The canons and prebendaries constitute a *chapter*, and their moderator, or presiding officer, is denominated a dean.

Deans are elected in conformity with letters-missive from the king; and, in modern chapters, by letters-patent from the king. The canons and prebendaries are sometimes appointed by the king, sometimes by the bishop, and sometimes by the chapter, according to the local regulations and prescriptive rights of different establishments.

The chapter is not only the electoral college for the choice of bishops, but is the bishop's council to assist him in the management both of the spiritual and temporal affairs of his diocese. They are also collegiate ministers for the cathedral service.

The Powers of Bishops.

1. Bishops have the exclusive power of ordination and confirmation. They may administer ordination anywhere, but they can administer confirmation only in their own dioceses.

2. They have ecclesiastical jurisdiction over their dioceses, and hold courts, in which they are assisted by a chancellor, who is required to be a doctor of the civil law.

The bishops also visit their dioceses for the purpose of instructing them, administering confirmation, directing their concerns, &c.

They consecrate church edifices; ordain, admit and institute priests; confirm, suspend and excommunicate church-members; grant licenses for marriage, &c.

Besides these spiritual functions, they have the administration of the revenues of their respective dioceses.

Archdeacons.

Archdeacons are priests invested with authority or jurisdiction over the clergy and laity, either through the whole diocese or only a part of it. The number of archdeacons in the prov-

inces of Canterbury and York is sixty. They are mostly deputies of the bishops, from whom they hold their appointments.

The archdeacon has a separate court, in which he sits as judge, or deputes his official to do so. An appeal is admitted from the archdeacon's to the bishop's court.

The archdeacons visit different parts of their districts once in every two years, when they inquire into the condition of the church edifices, reform abuses, administer discipline, and induct candidates into their benefices.

All the superior clergy, comprehending archbishops, bishops, deans, canons, prebendaries and archdeacons, are styled dignitaries.

Priests.

The order of the clergy of the church of England, below that of bishops, is, in conformity with Roman Catholic usage, denominated priests. These have power to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, and are the public preachers of the Gospel, and expounders of the word of God; but have not the rights of ordination or confirmation, both of which are restricted to the bishops, for the purpose of giving increased dignity and importance to that order. Priests are parish ministers. They may be parsons, vicars, or curates. When they are instituted pastors of parishes, with full possession of all their ecclesiastical revenues, they are called pastors or rectors. Those who are employed to officiate in the stead and place of an incumbent, and who are not invested with a right to the ecclesiastical revenues of the parish, are called vicars; that is, vicarious ministers, ministers officiating *for* others. When a rector and vicar are instituted in the same parish, the rectorship is a sinecure, and all parochial duties devolve on the vicar. One who officiates for a vicar is called a curate.

The right of presenting candidates to the charge of parishes belongs to the lords of the manors, or other persons ascertained by law, and is a species of incorporeal property. It is considered a property of very considerable value, as affording the pos-

sessor the means of obliging his friends, and providing for his relations.

The support of parsons is, in many cases, liberal; that of vicars is less ample, and that of curates least of all.

Besides ministers, parishes have church-wardens, and a parish clerk, chosen annually, either by the minister or the parish, or by both together, as the custom of the different parishes requires. The church-wardens have charge of the temporalities of the parish, and form an advisory council of the minister.

Parish clerks are usually appointed by the minister; sometimes by the parish; in which case, they are sworn into office by the authority of the king. In some parishes they are appointed annually.

The revenues of the church of England are derived partly from tithes, and partly from the avails of property devoted to ecclesiastical purposes. The church of England derives its tithe system, as it does many other of its institutions, from the Roman Catholics.

An ecclesiastical living is called a benefice.

CHAPTER III.

POLITY AND REVENUES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The church of England is as really a spiritual despotism as the church of Rome. It is not only a spiritual despotism, but a despotism, to a great extent, copied after that of Rome. Its ministry are a hierarchy, over which the membership have no control. The English people have a representation in the House of Commons, but there is no House of Commons to the English church. Their legislation is all done by *lords and masters.*

The church of England is, in a great measure, subordinated to the state, and the servant of the state. The king's headship

of the church enables him to look better after the security of his crown and throne, and the revenues of his kingdom. It enhances his regal power in the department of state, and makes him more entirely master of the temporalities of the nation.

It is, no doubt, better to have the king for a Pope, than to give that office to a bishop in Italy. It may be nearly as well as to give it to an English bishop, resident within his spiritual dominion, and devoted to it alone. But, O, how much better would it be to adopt the polity of Christ and his apostles for his church, and let it be both free and independent!

Under Henry VIII. and Charles II., the church of England was nearly as intolerant as that of Rome. But since the revolution of 1688 this intolerance has been, in some degree, relaxed; and, for many years past, dissenting orders in that country have enjoyed much greater liberty, and encountered much fewer and less serious annoyances, than in most Catholic countries.

The church of England is an organization of great strength. Its hierarchy have those ample powers and resources that make it hard to contend with them. They are rich, and well-disciplined, and the lower orders are entirely in the power of the higher.

The people may *desert* the establishment, but they cannot amend or revolutionize it. Every timber and plank in its structure is placed beyond their power. It stands by the side of the church of Rome, to which it sustains the relation of daughter to mother, and exhibits the strongly-marked lineaments of that mother in all her configuration and features.

It is the home, however, of many noble and good men, of many learned and great men, and the nursery of much sincere piety. So is the church of Rome. But its polity is an essential departure from that of Christ and the apostles.

The condition of the church of England in 1853

Benefices in England and Wales, ...	12,270
Their value, ...	£3,479,460
Parochial ministers, ...	17,151
Of whom, the curates, ...	4,885

The benefices increase at the rate of nearly one hundred a year.

The clergy increase at the rate of three hundred a year.

In 1835, more than four thousand curates officiated for non-resident incumbents, and only one thousand for resident incumbents.

In 1853, eighteen hundred curates officiated for non-resident incumbents, and more than three thousand assisted resident incumbents.

Some changes were made in 1853, in respect to the support of the bishops, by which the entire amount appropriated to that object will ultimately be reduced to £152,300, to be divided among twenty-seven archbishops and bishops, Sodor and Man not being included. This, if divided equally, would give each prelate £5,640.74 a year.

The support of deaneries is about . . .	£35,000	per ann.
" " " canonries, ...	90,000	" "
Minor-canonries, choirs, organists, and repairs,	87,000	" "
Total, ...	£212,000	" "

It is supposed that, with the improved management which is being secured for them, the estates from which the support of the dignitaries of the church of England are derived, and which are denominated the episcopal and capitulary estates, will yield a revenue of £809,000.

Of which, will be devoted to the support of bishops, deans, &c., ...	£364,000
Leaving to be devoted to other, and principally parochial uses, ...	135,000
Among the livings of the parochial clergy, 174 only amount to	£1,000 a year.
1,000 amount to	500 " "
More than 8,000 fall below	300 " "
And below these are 5,000 curates, whose salary falls below	100 " "

The clergy are not supported by the revenues of the church alone, but generally have private fortunes more than equal to their ecclesiastical revenues.

The salaries of the twenty-eight archbishops and bishops of the church of England, large as they are, five thousand six hundred and forty pounds per annum, for each, fall short of that given to the twenty-two judges in the courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, which average six thousand pounds each.

The total number of clergy connected with the establishment in 1853 was eighteen thousand three hundred and fifty.

The chance for promotion to the episcopacy is very small, one clergyman only in six hundred and forty-two attaining that distinction.

Sydney Smith says that, if the revenues of the church of England were equally divided among all its ministers, they would each receive about two hundred and fifty pounds per annum.

The tendency of the church of England is to make its ministers eminently prudent and *conservative*. None of the higher positions in its ministry can ordinarily be gained or approached, except by an eminently conservative policy. Persons that would rise to these positions must be *moderate men*, and ordinarily popular with all parties.

The episcopacy of the church of England, with its ample revenues, gives dignity and glory to the whole establishment. The cathedral dignitaries are Christian literati, and exert in many cases a beneficial influence as such.

In consequence of the higher ministerial dignities, the entire ministry is made a more gentlemanly order than it would otherwise be; and it secures a large portion of its recruits from the higher and more cultivated classes of society. There is a perceptible difference, in this respect, between the church of England and that of Scotland.

The church of England ministry is obtained from the middling and higher classes; that of the church of Scotland, principally from the middling and lower classes.

The social rank and influence of the clergy of the church of England have advanced very considerably during the last century; owing, in part, to their more liberal support than formerly, but mainly to their being taken from the best portion of the middle and higher classes.

A large portion of them derive a very inadequate support from their profession. The eight thousand curates whose support is less than three hundred pounds a year are inferior, in respect to their salaries, to an ordinary banker's or merchant's clerk.—Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1854.

CHAPTER IV.

PARTIES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The church of England has, for many years, been divided into two parties, called High-Church and Low-Church parties. The low-church party is sometimes called the evangelical party. Representatives of this party are found in Milner, Martyn, Thomas Scott, and Wilberforce. This party have always been active promoters of benevolent and religious objects, and have been instrumental in effecting important improvements and reforms. Its theology has been generally Calvinistic.

The high-church party leans strongly to the doctrines and usages of the Papists. Their watch-words are, Baptismal Regeneration, Church Authority, and Apostolical Succession. The high-churchman puts great stress on the episcopacy, and exalts the sacraments to be almost saving ordinances. He also makes great use of the cross as the symbol of the Christian faith, and attaches extravagant importance to clerical robes and liturgical services. The high-churchmen are essentially a clerical party,

exalting the ministry, and proportionally depressing the membership.

Of the twenty-eight bishops and archbishops of the church of England, thirteen are supposed to belong to the various shades of the high-church party, five to the low-church party, and ten are of an intermediate character, sometimes denominated Broad church. The highest shades of high-churchism differ but little from Romanism, and the passage is easy from this division of the church of England to that of Rome.

The tractarian movement in the church of England, in which Doctors Pusey and Newman have taken prominent and leading parts, is a legitimate development of high-church principles. High-churchism and Tractarianism are different stages of the development of principles, the consistent application of which is found in the Papacy alone.

Hence, the natural course of progressive minds in that direction, is to high-churchism first, then to the extreme of high-churchism, called Tractarianism and Puseyism, and, lastly, to the Papacy.

The connection of the church of England with the state, in having a common head, operates in many respects to its disadvantage. It reduces the state and church to a single complex establishment, and makes one an appendage to the other. The church may be first in theory, but the state is very likely to be first in fact. The church, therefore, becomes an appendage to the state; is subordinated to party and individual interests, and its eligible offices and livings are used for purposes of government patronage.

The parish minister, suddenly raised by the choice of the premier to the prelatical dignity, is subjected to great temptations. He has a seat in Parliament, and takes rank with the peers of the realm. On retiring from his parliamentary duties to his episcopal palace, he exerts an almost absolute control over one third of his subordinate clergy, and, by various indirect means, awes and controls the rest. Few question his opinions, or oppose

his will. A pious and good man must be resolute, indeed, not to be sometimes misled and unduly elated by such distinctions. And when the not pious, as sometimes happens, are exalted to these dizzy heights, the effect is liable to be disastrous in the extreme, both to them and to the interests of the church. Their distribution of livings, their visitation charges, their circuits for confirmation, and their general intercourse with their clergy, if not directed to the best ends, will sometimes subserve the worst.

Of the seventeen thousand and fifty-one ministers, large numbers do comparatively nothing, being relieved by vicars and curates; and of the thirteen or fourteen thousand working clergy, many are in parishes in the country, containing from one hundred and fifty to three hundred souls, while others, in the large cities, have monster charges of eight or nine thousand.

The church of England has the advantage of all other churches in that country in the following particulars:

1. It has the friendship and patronage of the government, and of all the great government officers. 2. It is the church of the aristocracy and gentry, and enjoys the public and private patronage of these classes. 3. The prizes held out to its ministry in the higher offices and dignities of the establishment, and other advantages, prove incentives to high cultivation, and induce large numbers from the best families and highest circles to enter the clerical profession.

Its communion embraces a large proportion of all the nobility, official standing, wealth, learning and refinement, of the nation. It has usually indulged in great superciliousness and arrogance towards dissenters; and will not be easily reclaimed from this error, till its peculiar relation to the civil government is dissolved.

Among its members are many excellent and pious men; great statesmen, eminent lawyers and jurists, wealthy bankers, merchants and manufacturers, and distinguished artists and scholars. But its polity is not that established by Christ and the apostles,

and is without any adequate foundation in the dictates of reason and experience.

The principal objections to the Papacy, as a system of church polity, bear with equal force against the church of England. It is a monarchical Papacy, and as absolute a despotism as that of Rome. Its ministry is not organized according to the plan of the New Testament, but according to a later method, of human device. The higher clergy are too much exalted, the lower too much depressed. There is not a proper equality maintained between them. The government and administration of its affairs is improperly taken out of the hands of the membership, and placed in the hands of its head and sovereign; and its ministry are in a sense the subordinates of the sovereign, administering by his authority; whereas, they ought to be the servants only of God and the membership.

This seems to be an advantage to the sovereign, and to conduce to the stability of the state. In some respects it is an advantage to the sovereign, and in some respects it does conduce to the stability of the state. But it is an unjust advantage; and is, therefore, unworthy of a good sovereign, and unnecessary in a well-constituted and well-administered civil government.

The civil government ought to be administered and supported for ends of its own. These, if properly chosen, are sufficient to engage the sympathy and friendship of the people, and to command their most determined support.

It may be said that church democracies, organized on the plan of primitive Christianity, would be unfriendly to monarchy and aristocracy, and would naturally lead to the gradual extension of popular rights and powers, and the equalization of privileges, till all the despotisms of the world would be undermined, every monarchy overturned, all aristocratic privileges annulled, and all the governments of the world reduced to the republican form. This may be. Church democracy may tend to promote democracy in the state. Church liberty may foster the spirit of civil liberty. Church government by the membership may

tend to equalize all conditions, and to abolish all artificial distinctions in society. It may abase the proud, and exalt the humble. It may overthrow, in its results, thrones, and dynasties, and aristocratic institutions. But it will replace them; not with anarchy and confusion, but with institutions of a nobler kind.

In the place of arbitrary principle, will come the law of God, justice, mercy, and the highest expediency; in that of hereditary legislators, elective and representative ones; in that of hereditary sovereigns, elective sovereigns, elevated by the choice of the people, understanding their interests and wishes, ruling in their name and for their benefit, for prescribed terms; and, after having served their time in the exercise of the prerogatives of sovereignty, returning with dignity and pleasure, and without regret, to the ranks of private life.

How much better to be such a sovereign than to be a king! Where is the king that surpassed the grandeur of Washington, of the Adamses, and of Jefferson? Those sovereigns lost none of their dignity when they resigned their offices as heads and sovereigns of a Christian and admiring nation, and returned to the ranks of the people. They could have gained nothing by the inheritance of a throne, and the power to transmit it to their children. Their country could have gained nothing by such an arrangement; nor do the inheritors of thrones, and of aristocratic privileges, gain anything by their high distinctions. Liberty and equality are the immutable laws of God; and any unnecessary departure from them is fraught with injury, on the whole, to all parties.

But democracy in the church does not commit its subjects to impracticable schemes for the promotion of the same in the state. It favors the greatest possible development of the intellectual and moral powers of the people, and leaves them in a spirit of love to God, and of good-will to all mankind, with modesty and sobriety, with prudence and care, to make the best of their existing conditions, and to change them only for the

better, by suitable and practicable means. If democracy in the church tends to promote democracy in the state, it is only as an improvement on other state organizations, and for the general promotion of liberty, virtue and happiness.

Democracy in the church tends to promote knowledge, piety, virtue and enterprise, in the church. It tends to exalt and ennoble the membership, by making them the kings and priests that other systems make their spiritual rulers. Religion cannot attain its most glorious conquests in any other method. This exaltation of the membership is the *true ideal* of church democracy. It is as yet but partially attained; but it is attained sufficiently to demonstrate its entire practicability, and its glory.

It is a common objection to church democracy that the people are not competent to receive such high trusts. Only a favored and learned few can have sufficient knowledge, capacity and virtue, to be intrusted safely with church rule. To this we reply, that what God hath cleansed is no longer unclean, and that the temples of the Holy Spirit, guided and led by infinite wisdom, trained and instructed in all the duties of piety and true virtue, are as fit and as competent to be intrusted with church power as the most enlightened monarch on his throne, or the most learned prelate.

DIVISION III.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER I.

ORIGIN OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

In the early settlement of the American colonies, Congregationalism was planted in New England, in 1620, at the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth. Dutch Presbyterianism was planted at New York and Albany, at about the same time, under the auspices of the Dutch West India Company, which first settled this region, and claimed jurisdiction over it for the Dutch. English Presbyterianism was first planted in Virginia, more than seventy years later, in 1690.

The Protestant Episcopal church of England had been introduced into Virginia before either of these other orders, in 1607; and had subsequently become the established church of that province, in imitation of the English church establishment at home.

Perfect religious liberty was not established in Virginia till after the revolutionary war, in 1785, when a law was enacted for that purpose. Subsequently all laws making the Episcopal church a state establishment were repealed.

Besides the establishment of Episcopacy in Virginia, Episcopal churches were organized in most of the other colonies, previous to the revolution; and all these churches were under the supervision of the bishop of London, as a part of his jurisdiction or diocese.

During the revolutionary war the Episcopal churches lan-

guished; but directly after that event they were revived, and measures were taken to multiply and extend them, and to reörganize them as an independent national establishment.

For this purpose Rev. Samuel Seabury, bishop elect of Connecticut, was sent to England for ordination, in 1784. Not being able to obtain it in England at that time, he went to Scotland, and obtained it of the nonjuring bishops of Scotland, in Nov. 1784.

The same year a plan of organization was proposed and debated at successive meetings of the Episcopal clergy of the country from different states, to embrace a lay delegation, in all the ecclesiastical courts. This plan was agreed upon in a convention at New York, in October, 1784; and the first convention of the church under it assembled at Philadelphia, September 27, 1785. This was the first general convention of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States. Delegates were present from thirteen states, and measures were taken to revise the prayer-book, to form an ecclesiastical constitution, and to obtain an Episcopate direct from England.

Rev. William White, bishop elect of Pennsylvania, and Rev. Samuel Provost, of New York, received testimonials of the convention, and went to England for consecration. A law having been enacted by parliament favorable to the object, they obtained consecration of the Most Reverend John Moore, archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by three other bishops, Feb. 4, 1787. Rev. James Madison, bishop elect of Virginia, obtained consecration from the same prelate, Sept. 19, 1790. Having now three bishops of the English succession, and one of the Scotch, the organization of the church was deemed complete, and from these bishops began the line of the American succession.

Since this time the growth of the Episcopal church has been rapid. In 1811 there were eight bishops and two hundred and thirty presbyters; in 1835, eighteen bishops, and more than twenty dioceses, and in 1850, twenty eight bishops, thirty-one

dioceses, thirteen hundred and thirty-four presbyters employed, and two hundred and nineteen unemployed.

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISCOPAL MINISTRY.

The ministry of the Episcopal church of the United States consists, like that of England and the Papacy, of three orders, bishops, presbyters or priests, and deacons.

Bishops.

The bishops are the highest order of the Episcopal clergy, and are considered as the successors of the apostles; with the sole right to administer ordination, confirmation and consecration of churches. The apostleship, as an ecclesiastical office, is claimed to have been made perpetual in the church, and to have been given exclusively to the bishops. In support of this, it is claimed that in the primitive church, and among the early church fathers, the bishops were styled,

1, Princes of the church; 2, Princes of the clergy; 3, High priests; 4, Chief priests; 5, Presidents of the church; 6, Fathers of the fathers; 7, Patriarchs; 9, Angels of the churches.

It is not only true that the bishops were very much exalted above presbyters, in the period intervening between the time of the apostles and the completion of the Papacy, in 606, but some of the bishops were very much exalted above others, and most of them very much exalted above the parochial bishops of apostolic times.

The bishops in the Episcopal church are the heads of dioceses, consisting of a state or part of a state

They call diocesan conventions, and moderate them superintend their clergy and laity; and visit regularly, as far as may be, all the parishes under their jurisdiction at least once in three years, to administer confirmation, and other episcopal rites of ordination, confirmation and consecration of churches.

In the election of bishops by the diocesan conventions, they are first chosen by the clergy, and then nominated to the lay delegation.

Bishops elect are ordained by the presiding bishop, assisted by any two other bishops, after having obtained the approbation of the general convention for the purpose. But when a year or more is to elapse, after the election of a bishop, before the meeting of the general convention, its approbation may be dispensed with, on specified conditions, embracing the consent of a majority of all the existing bishops, and of the standing committees of the dioceses.

Presbyters.

The presbyter is a minister of the second order, also called priest. He is considered as holding a rank in the Christian dispensation corresponding to that of the common priests under Judaism. The bishop is the high priest; the presbyter, the common priest. His sacerdotal office is supposed to consist in his officiating for the people, in offering up the sacrifice of the people's prayers, praises, and thanksgivings to God, in making intercession for them, and blessing them in the name of God, and absolving them.

The presbyter is the head of the parish over which he is established, as the bishop is the head of the diocese. The bishop is a diocesan minister, and the presbyter a parish minister. The presbyter's duties are to preach, administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, receive members and administer discipline, and to have a general supervision of his parish.

Deacons.

The deacon is the lowest of the three grades of the Episcopal

ministry. The name of deacon is of scriptural origin, and has always been preserved in the church as a title of office. That the deaconship is an office of the ministry, is argued from the fact, that they were required to be men full of faith and of the Holy Ghost; and that they received ordination from the hands of the apostles. Two of them, Stephen and Philip, are, subsequently to their ordination, found preaching; and Philip, in addition to preaching, is found baptizing.

The office of deacon, in the Episcopal church, is similar to the corresponding office in the church of England. Presbyters are first made deacons, which puts them nearly in the position of licentiates to preach in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. Deacons generally remain in that order a year or more, when they are promoted to the order of presbyters.

CHAPTER III.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH COURTS.

The Episcopal church is divided into parishes and dioceses.

Parishes.

A parish is a district or portion of the church forming the territorial jurisdiction of a presbyter. A parish usually has a single congregation, worshipping together, under a single rector, and with a single vestry. Parishes sometimes have a plurality of congregations, in which case the rector has an assistant-rector.

Parishes are divided territorially by the diocesan conventions. They elect their ministers, and hold annual meetings for the election of church wardens, who, with the minister as moderator,

constitute the vestry. The vestry is the society's committee for the transaction of business pertaining to the parish, particularly temporalities. When a parish becomes vacant, it is their duty to give notice to the bishop; and it is the duty of the bishop, on receiving such notice, to appoint occasional supplies.

When the parish chooses a minister, the vestry certifies the choice to the bishop: or, when the diocese is vacant, to the standing committee of the diocese. The bishop or standing committee confirm or reject his appointment. If the candidate is approved, the bishop institutes him rector, or ordains and institutes him, if he had not been previously ordained. Deacons must be received into the order of presbyters before being eligible to the office of church rectors. It is the duty of parish ministers to instruct the children in the catechism, and to be diligent in teaching the youth and others the doctrines, constitution and liturgy, of the church.

The parish is the elementary church organization, choosing its minister, and supporting him, and enjoying his pastoral care. In sending delegates to the conventions, the parishes become integral parts in the constitution of those bodies, and have a voice in deciding the great questions respecting the principles and polity of the order. The power of each parish in the conventions, however, is but part of a complex power made up of the power of the bishops, which is supreme, that of the clergy, and that of the laity.

Dioceses.

A diocese is a district of the church forming the spiritual jurisdiction of a bishop. Previous to the fourth century, the district of a bishop was called his παροικια, family, a name adopted in that period of primitive simplicity, when bishops and presbyters were the same. In the fourth century, the charge of the bishop having in many cases become enlarged, it was called his διοκησις, diocese, or jurisdiction.

Each diocese has an annual convention for the transaction of ecclesiastical business, consisting of the bishop and his clergy,

with a lay delegation from each parish; and new dioceses cannot be formed, nor old ones changed, without the consent of the general convention.

Every convention has a standing committee, to act, under due instructions in behalf of the convention, in the intervals between its meetings. These committees meet on their adjournment, and at the call of their moderator. When there is a bishop, this committee constitutes his advisory council, and attends him at his call. When there is no bishop, the standing committee has a general supervision of the diocese.

Besides the annual meetings of the diocesan conventions, special conventions may be called by the bishop at his discretion, or, when applied to for that purpose, by the standing committee; or, in case of the vacancy of the Episcopal chair, by the standing committee.

In the diocesan conventions, the clergy and laity deliberate in one body, and form a single house. The laity vote by congregations, each parish having a single vote, except when there is a plurality of congregations in the same parish, in which case a vote is allowed for each congregation.

The diocesan conventions hear reports from the bishops on the following subjects:

1, Visitation of churches; 2, Confirmations; 3, Admission to holy orders, institution of rectors, &c.; 4, Consecration of churches; 5, Reception of candidates for holy orders; 6, Dismission and reception of clergy; 7, Recommendations, suggestions, and admonitions.

They hear reports from the standing committee, of all their doings, and from the parishes, stating the number of families, baptisms, confirmations, communicants, Sunday-school scholars, missionary and charitable contributions, marriages and burials; and reports from missionaries.

The diocesan conventions make and amend their own constitutions and canons for the government of their clergy and laity, in conformity with the constitution and canons of the general

convention. They also appoint clerical and lay deputies to that body.

The General Conventions.

The general convention consists of all the bishops, together with one or more clerical and lay delegates from each diocesan convention. It has two houses, like the British parliament and the American congress.

The bishops constitute the higher house; the clerical and lay delegates, the lower. The senior bishop is moderator of the house of bishops, under the title of presiding bishop; and is a virtual *archbishop*, and head of the entire church.

1. He usually consecrates bishops. 2. He receives the testimonials of a bishop elect, in the intervals between the general conventions, and sends them to the other bishops, for their approval or disapproval. 3. He calls special conventions at the request of a majority of the bishops.

The seniority of the bishops is determined not by their relative ages, but by the times of their consecration.

The house of bishops is organized by appointing a secretary, and the house of delegates by appointing a president and secretary. The house of bishops has the exclusive right to propose acts for the concurrence of the other house; and, when any act has passed that house, it is transmitted to the bishops, to be affirmed or negatived by them.

The general convention is the supreme legislature of the church. It enacts canons, determining the different orders of the ministry, and the modes of electing and ordaining them, and adopts articles of faith and rules of order for the whole church. It is also the supreme court of appeal. Bishops may be tried by a court of bishops instituted for the purpose, but they have an appeal to the house of bishops.

The general convention appoints the board of missions triennially, and hears reports from them. Its constitution was adopted in 1789, and consists of nine articles. It is unalterable

unless after the alterations have been proposed to the dioceses, and in a general convention in which a majority of the dioceses are represented. The general convention determines the character of the church, and gives supreme direction to all its affairs.

CHAPTER IV.

CHARACTER OF AMERICAN EPISCOPACY.

THE Episcopal church in the United States has imitated the church of England in adopting a liturgy and a clerical habit, and observing a number of annual church festivals and fasts. Its liturgy is contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and is copied, with little alteration, from the liturgy of the church of England, as that is from the liturgy of the Roman church. The clergyman reads prayers in a white muslin surplice, and pronounces his sermon in a black robe; the white surplice signifying his office as a priest, to make intercession for the people, and the black robe his office as a prophet and teacher of divine truth. The Episcopal church admits wide diversities of faith, both in respect to doctrines and policy, but it is generally well united by the harmony and power of the bishops. Dissenters from prevailing views are perfectly powerless and harmless.

The Episcopal church imitates the exclusiveness of the church of England in claiming to be *the church*, and denouncing all other denominations as corrupt and schismatical.

It is a great improvement, however, on its English model, by incorporating into its constitution a republican element. The bishops and inferior clergy are not the sole absolute rulers of the church, as in English episcopacy. The parishes appoint church-wardens to compose, with the minister for its moderator, the vestry. The vestry appoints delegates to the diocesan con-

vention, and the diocesan convention appoints an equal clerical and lay delegation to the general convention.

This is a great concession to the laity; but it is not enough. If the laity have any rights at all in the matter, they have much greater rights than are conceded by this system.

The house of bishops might be abolished, and come into the house of clerical and lay delegates, making the general convention to consist of a single house; and still the clergy would have more than their just share of influence in the legislation and courts of the church.

But, as it is, everything is in their hands, and at their disposal; and not only so, everything is in the hands of the bishops, who are farthest removed from the laity, and have least sympathy with them. The bishops are absolute masters of the church. If they held their appointment from the laity, and represented their opinions and feelings, and if they held their appointment only for a term of years, the case would be different. But the bishops are not in theory or in fact the representatives of the laity, but their spiritual lords and masters. The laity concur in their appointment, in the diocesan conventions; but the conventions cannot give their election effect, without the concurrence of the bishops. When elected to the episcopal office, the bishop is accountable to his fellow-bishops, and not at all to the laity; so that the laity, as such, have no control over him whatever. He is placed not only above them, but beyond their reach, except through a court of bishops, or the whole house of bishops as a supreme court of jurisdiction.

What is the necessity of thus restricting the power of the laity, and, while pretending to give them a part in the government of the church, giving them only a shadow of power? What is the necessity of putting the church under a despotism of bishops? Are the laity less to be trusted, in the management of their affairs as a church of Christ, than the clergy? Are the lower clergy less to be trusted than the higher clergy? I think not. The Episcopal church is excessively conservative. This

arises from the supremacy of the bishops, who are far removed from the laity; from the ascendency of the clergy in the diocesan conventions, and their dependence on the bishops; and from the almost entire exclusion of the laity from the exercise of any controlling influence in directing and controlling the affairs of the church.

Lay deputies may seem to have influence as long as they propose things agreeable to the bishops and clerical delegates. But, in opposition to them, they can do nothing; not the least.

The sympathies of this church are greatest with the church of England, and considerable with the Roman Catholics, with whose system they have important elements in common. Erratic minds, that go from other Protestant orders to the Papacy, generally enter it through Episcopalianism, which they find a convenient half-way house, where to stop for a night and provide themselves for the rest of their journey.

CHAPTER V.

EPISCOPALIAN CONSERVATISM AND EXCLUSIVENESS.

The general policy of the Episcopal church is highly conservative. Its ministers are men of refinement, and its bishops are among the most aristocratic orders in the land. Its dignified and imposing service operates favorably and powerfully on its religious assemblies, in promoting dignity and propriety of deportment. Extempore services seldom equal the liturgical ones in dignity and propriety; but they have other advantages, which are, on the whole, greater, in their better adaptation to the ever-varying events of the times, and in their greater variety. Besides, they are conformable to apostolic practice, while liturgies are one of the labor-saving inventions of later times. It is

no objection to them that they save labor; but it is considerable in favor of non-liturgical services, that they are conformable to apostolic usage, while liturgies are not.

Liturgies were very brief and imperfect in the third century, when for the first time a beginning had been made of any considerable use of them; and from that time their growth was gradual and constant, till they reached the elaborate perfection and magnitude of the Greek and Roman services. — Murdock's Mosheim, vol. I., pp. 190, 277, 278.

The principal parties in the Episcopal church are the same as those in the church of England: the low-church party, who differ less from other Protestant orders, and recognize both piety, dignity and moral worth, beyond the bounds of their own establishment; and the high-church party, which tends strongly to the bigotry and superstition of the Catholics, and regards all non-episcopal orders as essentially defective and schismatical. The high church is in the ascendency, and is likely forever to hold the keys of Episcopal church power, and to be at the head of its affairs.

Nor is this party without much that is attractive and imposing. It lays great stress upon sacred vestments, holy places, appropriate and imposing church architecture, liturgical services, symbols of the cross, baptism, confirmation, and communion. It invests many of these objects with a mystic character, and makes them direct instruments for the bestowment of divine grace. It abhors levity in religion, and is disgusted with worldliness. It aims at eminent sanctity, and pursues it by the use of solemn forms, imposing ceremonies, and religious contemplations. It has great reverence for the fathers, for Romanism, and great horror of Protestant radicalism.

These principles operate on the entire denomination, and tend to give it a peculiar character. There is no other evangelical body that admits so great diversity of opinion on religious subjects among its members. Calvinists and Arminians, believers in future punishment and Universalists, pedo-Baptists and adult

Baptists, all belong to its communion and sit at its Lord's table together and in succession, and generally live in peace and love. They usually all agree in the love and veneration of their connection, and are zealous to extend it.

The conservatism of the Episcopal church is exhibited in various ways, and is best seen by contrast with other churches. At the time of the American Revolution, the Congregational and Presbyterian churches discussed the religious aspects of that great movement in their churches, and helped it forward. Their prayers and preaching were both revolutionary. The Episcopalian pulpits of the country at that time were generally silent on the subject, or counselled submission to the powers that were.

The great temperance reformation began in New England, and was early taken up in the pulpits, and commended by Congregational ministers to the religious sympathies and the support of the people. The Presbyterian pulpit followed in the same direction, and, to some extent, the Methodist. But the Episcopal pulpit has generally avoided the subject, or counselled caution and moderation in its prosecution by the people.

American slavery is felt by many to be the great sin of our nation, and our shame. The Congregational pulpit has in many cases enlisted zealously in the cause of the slave, arguing the wickedness of oppression, the enormous social wrongs to which it leads, and the retributive judgments which it provokes. The Presbyterian pulpit has in many cases done the same. So have the pulpits of other non-Episcopal religious orders; but the Episcopal pulpit sedulously avoids the subject, or counsels that we should dissent with extreme caution from the doctrines of the oppressor with regard to it.

It is no part of the mission of the Episcopal church to enter into the great movements of the age even in behalf of suffering humanity. It leaves those objects to be prosecuted in other methods and by other agencies, and confines itself mainly to conservative Christianity. Whatever falls within this category it

discusses with freedom and ability; but it seldom goes beyond this field.

In respect to exclusiveness, the church of England partakes of the same character as that of Rome. For many centuries the church of Rome has claimed to be the only true church, and the only safe repository of salvation for the human race. All her faithful members are sure of salvation. All her incorrigible enemies are sure to be damned. Rival bodies, claiming to be Christian churches, are objects of her particular dislike, and of her most terrible anathemas. The church of England has no favor for dissenting bodies. It does not recognize them as legitimate branches of the true vine, and pays no fraternal respect to their ministers and ordinances. A dissenting minister never preaches in a church-of-England pulpit, or assists him in the performance of public religious worship, nor does he walk by his side in religious processions.

The Episcopal church in the United States adopts the same policy. Some of its ministers and members think very well of the ministers and members of other American churches, and associate freely with them in general society. But they are not allowed by their ecclesiastical authorities to admit any fraternal intercourse between their own church and churches of other orders, as such, or to have a fraternal interchange of services with their ministers. They stand by themselves, and do not allow ministers of other orders to preach in their pulpits, or to aid them in their public ministrations. Why is this? On what principle does it proceed? And what valuable end does it answer? Is it just and right? Is it charitable and generous? If ministers are questioned about this, they sometimes tell us that, as for themselves, *personally*, they should be very willing to practise differently in regard to these matters; but they are subject to canonical and episcopal restrictions, holding them to their present policy. Some will admit that the policy is wrong, but still they are not at liberty to depart from it. If they minister by episcopal authority, they must conform to its laws.

There are two conceivable grounds on which to base a justification of this exclusive policy with respect to other denominations. The first is, that the Episcopal is the only true church, and that the others are all false. If this assumption is correct, Episcopal exclusiveness is perfectly right. True churches are not required to fraternize with the false, nor true ministers of Christ to give countenance to those wolves in sheep's clothing that, under pretence of guiding, protecting and feeding, the flock of God, scatter and destroy it. The second ground of justification is, that Christians of other orders have no just claims to fraternal recognition and coöperation on the part of Episcopalians. This is not obvious. It requires to be proved, and it will be hard to prove indeed.

Equality and fraternity is the common law of the individual; it is the common law of the state; and it is equally, and, if possible, still more the common law of the church. The individual has no right to ignore the existence of his neighbor, or withhold from him any countenance and support, any kindness and aid, by which it is possible consistently to serve him.

The state has no right to ignore the existence of its sister state, or to withhold from it any practicable services of love and well-doing. Different systems of government, and great diversities and contrarieties of opinion, feeling and habits, do not justify nations in withholding good-fellowship and international kindness from one another. Monarchies and republics, despotisms and democracies, live on terms of amity together, recognize each other as sister nations, bound together by common interests and common duties, and mutually love and serve each other.

Is the church alone excepted from the operation of this principle? Does the law of love, of fraternity and equality, and of fraternal intercourse in all kind offices, bind individuals and nations, and not bind the church?

Bigotry itself, with the cobwebs of ages hanging on its eyelids and obscuring its sight, cannot be blind enough not to see the falsity of this position. No subtle logic is requisite to disentan-

gle the truth, with regard to this subject, from its windings and ambiguities; no critical analysis to separate it from error. It stands out on the surface of things; it looms up to view like mountains towering to heaven, and burying their snow-crested summits in the clouds; it forces itself on our notice, and compels our recognition. We do not stop to argue with the man that has doubts, and fancies that this image of love is a spectre of delusion. We pity the weakness of his understanding; we detest the perversity of his heart.

DIVISION IV.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF METHODISM.

The founder of Methodism was John Wesley, the son of Rev. Samuel Wesley, rector of Epworth, in England. He received a liberal education at Christ's Church College, Oxford, where he took his first degree in 1724, at the age of twenty-one. He was then elected fellow of Lincoln College, and graduated Master of Arts in 1726, distinguished for his classical attainments, his skill in dialectics, and his poetical abilities.

Soon after this, he entered into holy orders in the church of England; and, from being a grave and sedate young clergyman, soon became distinguished for his zeal and earnestness both in personal religion, and in his labors for the promotion of piety.

In 1735, he accepted a mission to Georgia, in the then British colonies of America, for the purpose of preaching to the Indians.

His brother Charles, and two other English missionaries, with some Moravians, from Germany, accompanied him on that mission. The disturbed state of the colony rendering it impracticable for him to preach to the Indians, he preached to the colonists at Savannah; but was not well received by them, for several reasons; among which were his strict high-church views, his asceticism, or religious excesses, and some irregularity charged upon him in respect to a case of discipline.

After a year and nine months, he returned to England, where he attained new views, and supposed that he first experienced a *thorough conversion* the 24th of May, 1738, at the age of thirty-five. From this time he began those systematic and determined labors that made him the founder of Methodism. He exhorted and preached in the prisons and other public places, and made frequent and extended excursions into the country for the purpose of preaching. His discourses were extremely earnest and impressive, and attended with great effects. Loud outcries, painful convulsions and violent alarms, attested his power, and the power of divine truth under his administration. He labored, for a time, jointly with the celebrated George Whitefield, at Bristol. Some difficulty arising there with respect to a church that was being built, Wesley took the pecuniary responsibility of the house upon himself, and laid the foundation for that unlimited power which he gained over his followers in 1739. All the chapels that were subsequently built were either held by him, or by trustees subject to his absolute control. He now began to appoint lay preachers to supply the congregations that he had established, and extend his connection by establishing others.

From England Methodism spread into Scotland and Ireland, and, in 1766, was brought from Ireland to America, and landed in New York, by a company of Irish emigrants, who, under the direction of Philip Embury, a local preacher of their company, formed the first Methodist church in America, in 1766. This church grew rapidly, and, in 1768, the first Methodist chapel in America was built in John-street, N. Y., affording accommo-

dations for one thousand seven hundred hearers. Mr. Embury's first sermon in America was delivered to a congregation of five persons, in 1766; his first sermon in this great chapel, to an overflowing congregation, was on Oct. 30, 1768, after an interval of two years.

The next year, Mr. Wesley sent over two missionaries, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor, the former of whom took charge of the society in New York, and the latter went to Philadelphia. Two years later, he sent over Francis Asbury and Richard Wright; the former to be superintendent of all the Methodist societies in America.

A systematic itineracy had been previously established, and from this time it was regularly and extensively pursued.

On the breaking out of the revolutionary war, Mr. Wesley espoused the cause of the British government, and addressed a pamphlet to his followers in America, urging them to adhere to the British crown. When the war was over, he consecrated a bishop for the American portion of his church. The first Methodist bishop in America was Rev. Thomas Coke, LL.D., originally a presbyter of the church of England. He was authorized to associate Mr. Asbury with him as joint superintendent of the whole Methodist church in the United States. On Dr. Coke's arrival in America, a reörganization of the church was effected, under him and Mr. Asbury, at the general conference in Baltimore, Dec. 25, 1784.

Several secessions have since taken place in favor of a republican system of church government; but the Methodist Episcopal church has diffused itself with remarkable diligence and success through the land, and, in its two branches of Methodists north and Methodists south, is one of the largest and most powerful bodies of Christians in America.

The Methodist church had its origin in the church of England, in which its founder held the rank of a presbyter till his death. Its polity is based on the principles of that in the church of England, and corresponds to it in form.

The principal orders of the ministry are, 1, bishops; 2, elders; 3, deacons. Besides these, there are preachers, and exhorters, and local preachers.

Methodism was built up generally by the labors of its founder, and of others whom he enlisted in its service. It had its origin in Bristol, where the corner-stone of its first church edifice was laid, in May, 1739. From this time Mr. Wesley labored for it with indefatigable zeal and industry, till his death, at the age of eighty-eight, March 2, 1791. He generally preached two sermons a day, sometimes four.

During this interval of fifty-two years, he assumed no title but that of presbyter, which he had received in the church of England; but he exercised all the functions of a supreme bishop, with the most unlimited powers over his connection:

1, He presided in conferences; 2, Appointed all preachers, and assigned all preachers their places; 3, He made rules for the government of the connection; 4, He held and managed the funds; 5, He received, ordained, and dismissed all ministers, and directed them while in his service.

The bishops have not succeeded to these extraordinary powers, either in England or the United States. Their great powers are those of presiding in the conferences, ordaining elders and deacons, and appointing the travelling preachers to their stations and circuits. They have not, like the Protestant Episcopal bishops, any veto power on the action of the general conference, nor any vote in determining its decisions.

The standard of Methodism is the book of discipline, which contains its constitution and canons, and which is, in all important respects, unalterable.

The Methodist Conference in England, in 1846, had sixteen hundred and eighty-five ministers, fifteen thousand local preachers, thirty thousand leaders, stewards and trustees, and four hundred and sixty-eight thousand three hundred and thirteen members, with about two millions of hearers. There is an inclination in several of the leading clergymen in England

towards a greater conformity to the established church. Many desire to introduce the church service into all the chapels; and in London, and some other principal cities, the morning service is already introduced.

The number of Methodists south in the United States, in 1850, was four hundred and ninety-one thousand seven hundred and eighty-six; north, six hundred and sixty-two thousand three hundred and fifteen; total, one million one hundred and fifty-four thousand one hundred and one.

CHAPTER II.

THE METHODIST CLERGY.

Bishops.

The bishops are elected by the general conference, and consecrated by three bishops, or one bishop and two elders; or, in the absence of any bishop who can officiate in this service, any three presiding elders, appointed by the general conference for the purpose, may perform the part of the bishops in episcopal ordination.

The bishops preside at general and annual conferences; appoint preachers to their stations and circuits; change, receive and suspend preachers, in the intervals of the annual conferences; travel through the connection for the purpose of instructing and directing its affairs, and ordain bishops, elders, and deacons.

Bishops are amenable to the general conference, and, in the intervals between the general conferences, to a court of nine travelling elders, who may suspend them till the next general conference. In being amenable to the general conference, the Methodist episcopacy is amenable to the eldership. This is the great balance-wheel of the system.

Elders.

Elders are the second order of the Methodist ministry. They

are elected by the annual conferences, and consecrated by the bishop, and some of the elders present. They administer baptism and the Lord's supper, and perform all other general offices pertaining to the Christian ministry.

Elders are of two classes, travelling elders and presiding elders.

Travelling elders are the pastors of churches, located for the term of one year, subject to removal according to the rules of the itineracy; and presiding elders are the heads or pastors of districts.

The presiding elders are chosen by their bishops, and have the oversight of districts through which they travel, and in which they attend quarterly conferences, and superintend the concerns of the church.

They have spiritual jurisdiction over their districts, and, in the absence of the bishop, receive and suspend preachers, preside in the quarterly conferences of the district, attend the bishop when present, and give him all needful information of the affairs of the district when absent; but are not allowed to preside over the same district more than four years. The presiding elders are responsible to the annual conferences.

Presiding elders correspond to the diocesan bishops in the church of England, on a more humble scale, except that their office is rotary; and bishops correspond to the archbishops, with even greater powers.

Deacons.

Deacons, the third order of the Methodist ministry, are elected, like elders, by the annual conferences, and ordained by the bishops. They are allowed to preach and baptize, and to assist the elders in other duties; but do not administer the Lord's supper, nor pronounce the apostolic benediction. Candidates for the elders' orders must ordinarily serve two years as deacons, or four years as local preachers.

The lower orders of travelling and local preachers are occa-

sional assistants to the higher ministry; and, in some cases, candidates for it, licensed by the quarterly conferences.

The temporalities of stations and circuits are committed to stewards, who are appointed by the minister in charge, and whose duty it is to collect and pay to the minister his support, to raise and pay out money for other appropriate objects, such as the relief of the poor, and to report to the quarterly conference an exact account of their doings.

The salaries of bishops and travelling preachers are the same. A single man has one hundred dollars; a married man, two hundred. Children under seven, sixteen dollars extra; from seven to fourteen, twenty-four, besides travelling expenses; and the bishops have house expenses. The Methodist church is governed entirely by its ministry. The laity is not known in any Methodist church courts.

CHAPTER III.

METHODIST CHURCH COURTS.

The general conference consists of the bishops and a representation of one for every twenty-one elders from each of the annual conferences; appointed either by seniority or by election, that appointment being restricted to such as may have labored four years in the connection.

The general conference is moderated by one of the bishops, and, in the absence of a bishop, by an elder. It legislates for the entire church, subject to several restrictions, the principal of which are: 1, That it shall not revoke or alter the articles; 2, It shall not alter the ratio of representation in its own body, except within certain prescribed limits; 3, It shall not abolish episcopacy; 4, It shall not abolish the itineracy.

It is the supreme court of the church, and has appellate jurisdiction over all its ministers. It meets once in four years.

Under the general conference, and by its authority, the entire connection is divided into annual conferences, of which, in the Methodist church north, in 1850, there were twenty-nine, and in the church south, twenty.

Annual Conferences.

An annual conference is composed of such bishops as may be in attendance, and all the travelling preachers, elders and deacons, belonging to a defined portion of the church territory. The times of holding the annual conferences are appointed by the bishops, who are obliged to hold them at least one week. Each conference appoints the place of its meeting.

The annual conferences are moderated by one of the bishops, and reply to his inquiries on eighteen points: 1. What preachers are admitted on trial? 2. Who remain on trial? 3. Who are admitted into full connection? 4. Who are the deacons? 5. Who have been ordained elders? &c. &c.

The annual conference elects elders and deacons, and has the general government of the church and clergy, subject to an appeal to the general conference. It receives and adjudicates complaints and charges against any of its members, and reproves, suspends or expels them, as the case may require.

Quarterly Conferences.

The quarterly conference is composed of the travelling and local ministers, leaders of classes, and stewards, within the bounds of a circuit or station. It has jurisdiction over local ministers and preachers below the order of travelling deacons.

It licenses, in the first place, all preachers and exhorters, and gives recommendation for admission into the travelling connection, without which such admission cannot be obtained. Appeals lie from the discipline of the church to this court; and from this to the annual conference.

Stations and Circuits.

When the minister in charge preaches at a single place, it is

called a station; when he preaches at several places, it is called a circuit.

The Methodist church, in any place, is a local society, with a board of trustees, elected by the congregation, for holding church property, and attending to the temporalities of the church. This society concurs with the minister in charge, in admitting and expelling members, either in general meetings or by its committees.

Classes.

Societies are divided into classes of about twelve persons, under the direction and supervision of a class-leader.

The class-leaders are required to see the members of their classes at least once a week, and, 1, To inquire how their souls prosper; and, 2, To advise and comfort, and exhort and reprove them, as occasion may require.

No candidate can be admitted to the church till he has joined a class, undergone a trial of six months under a class-leader, and is recommended by his leader. The church or society, at any station, has the full charge of discipline, subject to an appeal to the higher courts; but all the great interests of the order are in the hands of the bishops and other clergy.

The Methodist church north have book concerns in New York and at Cincinnati, for the purpose of furnishing its members with cheap religious books and periodicals, favorable to their order, with a capital of nearly a million of dollars. These book concerns have been powerful auxiliaries of their ministry, in diffusing and sustaining Methodism throughout the land. The Methodist church south has a similar book concern.

The salary of a Methodist minister is raised by the voluntary contributions of his charge.

CHAPTER IV.

THE METHODIST ITINERACY.

An important feature in the character of Methodism is the itineracy. Other denominations have a settled ministry, and aim to make the pastoral relation as permanent as possible. Instances are frequent of the same pastor serving a church twenty, thirty, and sometimes forty or fifty years. There are great advantages in this, both to the pastor and people; and the plan is believed to be beneficial, on the whole, though liable to abuses, and attended, at times, with many inconveniences. When the pastorate is not settled permanently, but is hired by the year, it is still often continued in the same church for many years in succession, making a virtual settlement.

But the Methodist ministry is distributed on different principles, and undertakes to imitate the Saviour somewhat literally, by *going about doing good.* It also claims to imitate, in this branch of its polity, the practice of primitive times, as illustrated in the history of Paul and others, whose itineracy was scarcely less constant than that of their Master.

John Wesley commenced the system of the itineracy, as the best method possible, in his judgment, of meeting the urgent necessities of his first societies; and his observation of the benefits of this method was such as led him to adopt it, and impose it permanently upon his order, as one of the essential principles of the system, which the members are not at liberty to change. This establishes a circulating ministry, located, by the bishop, at the annual conferences, with the advice of the presiding elders, for the term of one year, and subject to reäppointment to the same charge a second year only.

This location is either as minister on a station, or on a circuit, with one stated place of preaching, or with several places. It is attended with the inconvenience of frequent removals on the part of the ministry, and frequent changes on the part of stations and circuits; but it relieves the minister from all concern in respect to these changes; avoids all considerable losses of time, by allowing no intervals between leaving one charge and assuming another; and distributes the talent, learning and ability, of the ministry, more equally than the independent system of permanent settlements and stated supplies.

When the independent system is well administered, it is the best; because it allows the greatest liberty both to the minister and people, and leaves the supply and demand to the same unshackled freedom, in respect to the ministry, which is found to be, on the whole, expedient in respect to other things.

Liberty is too precious ever to be surrendered but for the most weighty considerations. Churches ought not to give up the liberty of selection in respect to their ministers, nor the ministers their liberty of selection with respect to churches, on the ground of a slight temporary advantage, or a great temporary advantage, if it is not a matter of urgent necessity, or of advantage on the whole.

General principles ought never to be departed from without great and manifest necessity. It is a general principle that ministers and churches should retain their rights in their own hands to as great an extent as possible. This may not be best in every particular case, but it is likely to be best on the whole.

Ministers can find churches, and churches can find ministers. The supply and demand can meet on common grounds of freedom, without either party resigning its rights. If it is deemed best to allow a negotiator between these two parties, it may be on a system of freedom, as well as on that of despotism. Ministers and friends naturally become such negotiators. They say to a church, Such a man would be a good minister for you.

They say to the minister, Such a church would be a suitable charge for you.

The Methodist manner of distributing and locating the ministry is similar to what it would be for a merchant to stand between the producer and consumer, on the principle of taking all that is produced at a fixed price on exchange, and distributing his products to all that consume according to his judgment. The bishop takes from the stations and circuits all the ministers, and exchanges them according to his discretion. His office is one of exchange, not of money, or of common material products, but of ministers; of general exchange, at stated times, for the supposed benefit of the whole church.

And this is submitted to in preference to the plan of settled ministers, the ministers distributing themselves according as they may be in demand, and as they and the churches severally may judge best.

Extempore preaching, which has ever been another peculiarity of Methodism, is undoubtedly the best style of preaching for the wear of the ministry and for popular effect, and ought to be encouraged in all orders.

CHAPTER V.

GENERAL VIEWS AND ESTIMATES OF METHODISM.

The objections to the Methodist polity are the same that lie against the Papal and other episcopal polities. It is a spiritual despotism. It divides the church into two classes, the clergy and laity, and subjects the laity to the government of the clergy. It divides the clergy into different orders, and subjects the lower orders to the government of the higher, and all subordinate orders to the government of the highest.

This is copying essentially the despotism of the Papacy, and neglecting the freedom and independency of Christ and the apostles. It concentrates the power of the many in the few. It is well calculated for efficiency, as the experiment of its origin and progress thus far clearly shows. But it is not adapted to the highest and noblest possible development of the human virtues, nor for the most effectual promotion of the great interests of liberty, justice and mercy, among men. It is a vast and powerful system of enginery for a specific purpose, and capable of serving the cause of God to a certain degree, but not to the greatest extent possible. It has not the capabilities of the greatest possible usefulness which belong to the plan of freedom. It has in it, like the Papacy and like other episcopal establishments, elements of excessive conservatism, that have already hindered its progress in the great race of humanity, and must do so more and more in the mighty exigences that are yet to arise.

The working of Methodism has thus far been, to a great extent, highly favorable to the interests of religion. It has become a powerful coadjutor with the other great churches of Christendom in the extension of Christianity. It numbers throughout the world a membership of near two millions, and is eminently aggressive in its character. Other forms of episcopacy have worked well in good hands. The Papacy is capable of working well in good hands.

But none of their systems recognize the spiritual rights and dignities and the capabilities of the laity. They regard the laity as children that must be taken care of, not as mature men, that are capable of taking care of themselves, and must take care of themselves, in order to attain the noblest and most perfect development of Christian character. Yet such is the fact. However it may be with the heathen and infidels, Christians, those who are enlightened by the word and Spirit of God, are as capable of self-government in the church as in the state. They can perform its functions better than others, be depended upon with more certainty, and their errors and mistakes are more easily corrected.

CHAPTER VI.

THE THEOLOGY OF METHODISM, AND ITS PRACTICAL EFFECT.

The theology of Methodism is Arminian. At the time of its origin, and since that time, the Arminian theology has been extensively prevalent in the church of England, notwithstanding the Calvinistic character of its thirty-nine articles of faith. It has also been generally adopted by Episcopalians in America, and uniformly by Episcopal Methodists in all parts of the world. The Methodists early distinguished themselves not only as the subjects of Arminianism, but as its champions and zealous propagators. Express provision was made by Mr. Wesley to perpetuate this peculiarity of religious faith in his order, together with episcopacy and the itineracy.

The Methodist clergy and membership have been distinguished from the beginning by great zeal and earnestness in religion. They derived this character from the founder of their order, and they have taken means to preserve it, and hand it down to future ages. Their preaching is a constant appeal to the deepest and most powerful susceptibilities of the human heart, and is eminently practical and hortatory.

In some respects, the system of Methodism is a return to reformed Popery. It copies the ascetic severity of the Papal system, its independence and absolutism, putting everything in the hands of the clergy; and its attempt to be unchangeable. Other Protestant orders have thought proper to retain the power of changing both their articles of faith and systems of polity, if they see fit; but Methodism stereotypes both, and makes essential changes in them impossible without the destruction of the order.

The practical working of Methodism has been excellent. It has preached the Gospel extensively, and multiplied converts to righteousness to the number of millions. It has become one of the great spiritual powers of Protestant Christendom, and is exerting a mighty and controlling influence on human society in favor of piety and virtue. Its operation has been particularly beneficial in the United States, where its ministers have pursued the stream of emigration to the new settlements, and contributed powerfully to impress religious truth on society in its forming stages, and to direct its formation according to the principles of the Gospel.

It embraces all the great essential truths of Christianity, and argues and enforces them with great earnestness, often with great logical force of argument and persuasive eloquence; and generally, by God's blessing, with great effect. No other religious order has done so much, or had such very distinguished prosperity, in the same time. In the course of a century, its communion has grown to the extent of millions.

Many judge this great success of Methodism to be a conclusive argument in its favor, as the most correct and best of all the religious orders. It is an argument in its favor. It shows that the system is wisely adapted to effect the great purposes of religion, and that it is honestly and faithfully used. It shows, also, that God accepts its offerings and labors, and deigns to be a co-worker with its ministers and members. But it is not the seal and evidence of its entire conformity to the will of God, or its expediency as a system of agencies to bless and benefit men. It does not prove that it is the best system possible in all respects, or even that it is the best, on the whole, which is now under experiment.

Presbyterianism has had great success, and done great good too. Congregationalism has had great success, and done great good. Churches must be judged by their fruits. But their fruits do not all appear in a single generation, or a single century; and

they require to be observed and scrutinized with great care, to be fully and correctly apprehended.

Methodism has by no means a monopoly of piety and virtue, nor of usefulness and success. The Congregational order especially puts in its claim to the honor of having performed some of the greatest services for the human race that have ever been rendered, both in its practice and promotion of scriptural piety and virtue; in its promotion of personal independence and dignity of character on the part of its membership; in its effectual opposition to despotism, both in church and state; in its promotion of civil and religious liberty; in its having produced and contributed effectually to sustain the independent republican government of the United States; and in its general and powerful influence to encourage a universal resort to republicanism throughout the world.

The state and church are bound together by natural affinities, and the principles that predominate in one are naturally by that circumstance commended to the other. Liberty in the church is the parent of liberty in the state, and church despotisms favor the prevalence of state despotisms. With all its excellences, Methodism has the disadvantage that it is a system of spiritual despotism, and as such must be the ally and supporter of other despotisms.

Individuals may have the blessed inconsistency to prefer despotism in the church, and democracy in the state. They may not see that both ought to be governed on the same principles, and that the system which is, on the whole, best for one, is best for the other. It is conceivable that the whole body of Methodists in a republican country may be republicans in respect to civil government, and hierarchists, ministerialists, or Episcopalians, in respect to the church. But their support and administration of church despotism will, by a natural affinity, on numberless occasions, and more especially in great emergencies which try men's souls, and put their practical principles to the test, operate to

the promotion and support of civil despotisms, and the abridgment of republican liberty.

But we are not left to experiment, and reasoning from general principles, to determine this matter. We have the sure word of God, and the established ordinances of his kingdom, for our guidance. The divinely-appointed polity of the church is that of *church democracy*, and not of episcopacy, or any other form of despotism. Neither was the primitive church ministry an itineracy, but a settled ministry. From these decisive and superior authorities it cannot be safe nor right to depart; nor can any departure from them be advantageous to the interests of religion and human happiness, on the whole.

DIVISION V.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

The Presbyterian church is so called from its government by presbyters, or elders. There are many denominations of Presbyterians, the principal of which are:

1. The Old School Presbyterians of the United States.
2. The New School Presbyterians of the United States.
3. The Cumberland Presbyterians.
4. The Dutch Reformed.
5. The German Reformed.
6. The Associate Reformed (Covenanters).
7. The Associate Presbyterian.
8. The Presbyterian churches of Scotland, and other countries.

1. The Old School Presbyterians of the United States are so called on account of their strict adherence to the Westminster confession of faith, the old Calvinistic theology, and old measures.

2. The New School Presbyterian church of the United States is so called on account of its admitting new views in theology, the principal of which are the doctrine of general atonement, the natural ability of all sinners to repent, and the sufficiency of divine grace for the salvation of every human being, and new measures for the promotion of piety. The New School Presbyterians originated by secession from the Old, in consequence of an act of excision, by which four synods, supposed to be particularly infected with new views in theology, and opinions in favor of new measures, were exscinded, without trial, from the entire body, in 1837.

3. The Cumberland Presbyterians were formed by secession from the synod of Kentucky, in 1810. They have one general assembly, fifteen synods, four hundred and eighty churches, three hundred and fifty ministers, and fifty thousand members.

4. The Dutch Reformed church was organized by the Dutch from Holland, after the pattern of the Dutch national church. It has in this country two hundred and ninety-two churches, two hundred and ninety-three ministers, and thirty-three thousand five hundred members.

5. The German Reformed church was organized by emigrants from Germany, after the model of the German Reformed churches in Europe. It was first introduced into the United States in 1740. It has two hundred and sixty-one churches, two hundred and seventy-five ministers, and seventy thousand members.

6. The Associate Reformed Presbyterian church was formed by secession from two slightly different denominations of Scotch Presbyterians, in 1782. It has three synods, twenty-two presbyteries, two hundred and nineteen ministers, three hundred and

thirty-two churches, and twenty-six thousand three hundred and forty members.

7. The Reformed Presbyterian church (Covenanters) was formed by secession from the church of Scotland, on the ground of denying the right of the civil government to control the church, in 1688. They have fifty churches, about fifty ministers, and about six thousand members.

8. The Associate Presbyterian church in the United States is copied after the model of the church of Scotland. It has one general synod, thirteen presbyteries, two hundred and fourteen churches, one hundred and twenty ministers, and about nineteen thousand members.

Besides these, there are the great Presbyterian churches of Scotland, those of England, Holland, France, Germany and Switzerland.

The polity of all these churches is essentially the same. They admit three classes of church officers; ministers, or preaching elders, ruling elders and deacons. Two only are considered essential, ministers and ruling elders.

1. The ministers preach the Gospel, administer all church ordinances, preside in church sessions, and are *ex-officio* members of all presbyteries and synods within whose jurisdiction they belong, and are eligible to all higher church courts.

2. The ruling elders neither preach nor administer the sacraments, though, in the absence of deacons, they have charge of the Lord's table, and distribute the elements to the communicants. But their principal function is, with the aid of the ministers, to govern the church and administer its discipline.

3. The deacons, in churches where that office is admitted, have charge of the church poor, and make provision for the supply of the Lord's table.

The Presbyterian church courts consist of sessions, presbyteries, synods and general assemblies. Some of the smaller Presbyterian bodies have only sessions and presbyteries; others

add synods, and the larger denominations of Presbyterians have general assemblies.

The Presbyterian church is divided into particular churches. A particular church consists of those members which are under the jurisdiction of a particular session, and who usually worship at the same place. The church elects its minister, elders and deacons. Its elders and deacons are ordained by the minister, and its minister by the presbytery. All its officers are appointed for life, except that it can employ a temporary ministry. When its ministry is for life, it is called a pastorate; when for a limited period of a year, or a term of years, it is a stated supply. Having elected its officers, the church has no more to do with ecclesiastical affairs. Its officers are amenable to the higher church courts, and, if their administration is not satisfactory, aggrieved members may go to those courts for redress.

CHAPTER II.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH COURTS.

Sessions.

The session consists of the pastor, or stated supply, and the ruling elders of a particular church. The number of elders varies from two to ten. It is seldom allowed to fall below two, and ordinarily does not exceed five or six. The pastor and two elders constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The pastor is always moderator of this court when he is present. In his absence, and when a church is without a pastor, the session is not allowed to transact judicial business without calling in the aid of a neighboring pastor, or other minister, as its moderator. Where there are two or more pastors in the same church, they preside in the session in turn, or according to any

other arrangement that may be satisfactory. When it is impracticable, or extremely inconvenient, to obtain a minister to act as sessional moderator, one of the elders may be appointed to this office.

The session has the entire spiritual government of the church, subject to an appeal to the higher courts.

1, It inquires into the knowledge and conduct of the members; 2, Calls offenders and witnesses before it, and tries cases of supposed misconduct; 3, Admonishes members; 4, Rebukes, suspends or excommunicates, those who are judged to be unworthy; 5, And appoints delegates to the higher courts.

The pastor convenes the session at his discretion, and at the request of any two elders, and keeps an accurate and full record of its proceedings. In the absence of a pastor, or his inability to record the proceedings of the session, one of the elders is appointed to act as secretary.

Presbyteries.

The presbytery consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each church within a certain district. Collegiate churches are represented by two or more elders, according to the number of their congregations and pastors; and when two or more congregations are united under one pastor, they are entitled to be represented by one ruling elder only.

Three ministers, and as many elders, constitute a quorum. The presbytery, 1, Receives and issues appeals from the sessions; 2, Decides on references from that court; 3, Examines and licenses candidates for the ministry; 4, Ordains, installs and removes ministers; 5, Admonishes, suspends or deposes the unworthy; 6, Examines, approves or censures, the records of the sessions; 7, Resolves questions of doctrine or discipline; 8, Condemns erroneous and injurious opinions and practices; 9, Visits churches for the purpose of redressing evils that may have arisen in them; 10, Unites or divides churches or congre-

gations, at the request of the people; 11, And does whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care.

The presbyteries are required to keep a full record of their proceedings, and to report annually to the synod their doings, and the condition of their churches.

The presbytery meets at its own adjournment, and it is the duty of the moderator to call special meetings at the request of two ministers and two elders of different churches. The business of special meetings is specified in the circular letters calling them, and nothing else can be done. Presbyteries meet regularly twice a year, and require reports from all the sessions once a year.

Synods.

A synod consists of three or more presbyteries, and meets annually. Seven ministers, and as many elders, constitute a quorum, provided not more than three of the ministers belong to the same presbytery.

1, The synod receives and issues all appeals from the presbyteries; 2, Decides concerning references; 3, Reviews the records of presbyteries; 4, Redresses whatever is done by the presbyteries contrary to order; 5, Erects new presbyteries; 6, Divides or unites presbyteries; 7, And decides all questions of doctrine and discipline.

The synods keep a fair and full record of all their proceedings, and submit them annually to the inspection of the general assemblies.

The General Assemblies.

The general assembly is the highest Presbyterian church court, and consists of an equal delegation of ministers and elders from the presbyteries, in the following ratio:

1, Each presbytery of not more than twenty-four ministers sends one minister and one elder; 2, Each presbytery of more than twenty-four ministers sends two ministers and two elders;

and in a like proportion for larger numbers. The delegates to the general assembly are called commissioners, and are admitted on certificates from their presbyteries. Fourteen commissioners, one half of whom are ministers, constitute a quorum.

1, The general assembly receives and issues all appeals and references from the lower courts; 2, Reviews the records of synods; 3, Decides all questions of doctrine or discipline; 4, Bears testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any church or presbytery; 5, Erects new synods; 6, Corresponds with foreign churches; 7, Suppresses schisms; [8, In the case of the Old School Presbyterians, appoints church boards of missions, education, and religious publications;] 9, And superintends the concerns of the entire church.

All the church courts are opened and closed with prayer; and all above the church session appoint their moderators and clerks annually or semi-annually; or else have stated clerks holding office for an indefinite period, while the moderators are appointed annually in the case of the general assembly and synods, and semi-annually in that of the presbyteries.

The session is a permanent body, elected by the church. The presbyteries are representative bodies, with respect to the eldership, who attend as delegates from the sessions. The ministers in presbytery do not sustain a representative character. The synods are bodies of the same kind as presbyteries, only larger. General assemblies are representative bodies based on the presbyteries. The clerical commission in the general assembly represent the ministers in the presbyteries, and the eldership commissioners the presbyterial eldership.

The fundamental principles of Presbyterianism are those which relate to the eldership as church rulers, holding their offices for life; to the ministry as of a single order; to sessions as a court of church elders, and to presbyteries as a court of ministers and elders. All Presbyterian churches agree essentially in respect to the nature of these offices, and the functions of these courts. The most complete development of Presbyterianism is

under the general assemblies, and in large national establishments.

The Old School organization in this country is the most perfect, in having a system of church boards for the prosecution of general benevolent church objects. These are,

1, A board of foreign missions; 2, A board of domestic missions; 3, A board of education for the assistance of indigent candidates for the ministry; and, 4, A board of religious publications.

These boards are an important addition to the Presbyterian system of earlier years, and are engines of great denominational power and usefulness. They are one great cause of the remarkable success and prosperity of the Old School body, since the division and separation from the New.

Licentiates.

Presbyterianism admits but a single order of ministers, denominated pastors, evangelists and stated supplies, and, generally, ministers; sometimes bishops and elders. But it also admits a sub-order of *licentiates*, corresponding to deacons in Episcopal churches, who have authority to preach, but do not administer the church sacraments, nor pronounce the apostolic benediction.

Licentiates are candidates for the ministry, admitted to preach for the term of two years, or more, on trial, with a view to their being fully introduced into the ministry, after they shall have given sufficient evidence of their qualification for the work.

Candidates for licensure are required to sustain an examination by presbytery,

1, In the original languages of the Holy Scriptures; 2, The liberal arts and sciences; 3, Natural and revealed theology; and, 4, Ecclesiastical history and church government.

The ceremony of licensure is a lower grade of ordination, without the imposition of hands.

CHAPTER III.

THE PRINCIPLES OF PRESBYTERIANISM.

The supreme authority in Presbyterian churches is vested in their highest church court. In those churches that have general assemblies it is vested in the general assembly. The standards of the two great national Presbyterian churches of the United States, the Old and New School, are the Westminster confession of faith, catechisms and discipline, construed more strictly by the Old School, and a little more liberally by the New. All licentiates give their assent to these at their licensure, and all ministers, elders and deacons, at their ordination.

The general assembly, which is supreme under these standards, both in respect to its judicial and legislative powers, has no power to alter these standards, without proposing specific alterations to the presbyteries, and obtaining the assent of a majority; so that the standards of the whole church are determined and amended by the general assembly, in conformity with the expressed will of the presbyteries alone, and by their authority.

Presbyterianism is sometimes described and advocated by its friends as a system of church republicanism. The elders are considered as representatives of the churches, and the churches are considered as administering their affairs, in all the church courts, on the representative principle. But this is an entire mistake. There is no representation of the church in the church courts. All those courts are established over the church, and are independent of it.

It is essential to a representative system, 1, That the representative should be appointed by the constituency which he represents; and, 2, That he should be appointed for an occasion, or a limited period, of a year, or a term of years, in order that,

as changes of opinion and feeling may occur in the constituency, their representative may be chosen so as faithfully to represent them.

Hence, in mixed governments, partly monarchical and partly republican, the representative branches of the government hold their offices for a year or term of years, and the monarchical for life. Civil magistrates, who are appointed for life, do not officiate as representatives of the people. By the single circumstance of having their appointments for life, they are placed above the people, and become their masters, instead of being their representatives and servants. Limited appointments are necessary to real representation in the persons appointed to hold offices either in church or state.

It is clear, therefore, that Presbyterianism is not, as is supposed by some, a system of church government on the principle of representation. The session is not a representative court, in which the elders represent the church. To make it such, the eldership ought to be appointed annually, or for a term of years. It is rather a court of monarchs, or aristarchs, who hold their office for life; a limited monarchy indeed, as so-called monarchies in the state usually are; but a real monarchy, nevertheless; or, more strictly, an aristarchy of rulers appointed for life, and ruling on the principle of elective aristarchy.

The ministers constitute a class of church rulers above the elders, as being the exclusive moderators of sessions. Their position as moderators is more influential and commanding than that of simple deliberators and voters, and, in having a casting vote in the case of a tie, they determine many of the most important questions that come before their sessions.

The presbyteries and synods are mixed courts. 1, Partly courts of ministers, consisting of all the ministers of certain districts; 2, Partly courts of the representatives of the eldership in church sessions, consisting of one delegate from each session.

In theory the ministers and elders meet in these courts in equal numbers, or in as nearly equal numbers as may be. But

in fact the ministers almost always have a large majority; and this is greater in the synods than in the presbyteries, on account of the greater distance of the place of meeting from the majority of the churches, and the considerable trouble and expense of attending such meetings.

The half representation, which, in effect, is somewhat less than half, often not a fourth, in presbyteries and synods, is a representation of the eldership, the aristarchy of the churches, not the churches themselves. This is very far, indeed, from being republican representation of the membership.

General assemblies are representative courts based on the presbyteries, in which the ministers and elders of the presbyteries are represented equally. The representation, therefore, is of essentially the same kind as that of the presbyteries.

The ministers and elders of the Presbyterian church are accountable to presbyteries, subject to an appeal to the higher courts, but are not accountable to the membership. The government of the Presbyterian churches, therefore, is as much a despotism as that of the Methodists, the Episcopalians, and the Roman Catholics.

It was designed to be an improved system of episcopacy, restricting the bishop to a parish, and the presbyters to the exercise of parish jurisdiction, and governing the larger districts of the church by courts of bishops, assisted by equal numbers of presbyters. The principles of the Presbyterial and Episcopal systems are the same. Neither allow the powers of church government to be vested in the membership; neither give the membership any controlling influence in determining the form and organization of the church, or directing its policy and discipline.

The ministry and eldership control all ecclesiastical matters in the Presbyterian church; the former exerting, on the whole, the preponderating influence; just as much as the episcopacy and presbytership has the control of Episcopal churches.

This system had its origin in Switzerland, and is the invention of John Calvin. Calvin prepared it, and procured its adoption

first at Geneva, in 1541. From Geneva it was introduced into France, among the Waldensian churches of Piedmont; into Holland, Germany, Hungary, Scotland and England; and from England and other European countries it was subsequently brought by immigration to America, and planted, with the other institutions of Europe, in this New World.

Some branches of the Presbyterian church have deviated from the plan of Calvin, by appointing an annual eldership. This arrangement, or the plan of choosing elders for a term of years, such as three or four, makes the eldership a representative body, which is an element of republicanism, but leaves the church republicanism overwhelmed by the ministerial element.

Another republican element might be introduced by making the laity eligible to seats in all the higher courts. This would effect a diffusion of church power, and lead to a greater participation and interest of the laity in church affairs. Such a system would not be complete church republicanism; but it would be a combination of ministerialism and republicanism, which would leave little more to be desired.

Presbyterianism, at the time of its origin, was the nearest approximation to religious republicanism that seems to have been thought of. Monarchical and despotic principles were in universal ascendency in the state and church, and to descend from them at once to a spiritual democracy was too great a step for the human mind.

Presbyterianism was a great innovation on priestly prerogative, and a great restriction of episcopal authority in favor of the people. The eldership were elevated so little above the membership, and their sympathies and interests were so much with them, that their power was accepted as an equivalent for the power of the membership, and as generally to be depended upon in their favor. The system was, therefore, generally popular with the people, and attracted immediate and general attention wherever the doctrines of the reformation were received. At one time it threatened to compete with Lutheranism for the

control of Protestant Germany. But Lutheranism was earliest in the field, and met so well the exigencies of the times, that it was able, generally, to hold its ground against this later and more popular system of church polity.

Presbyterianism seems to have fully met the demand for the influence of the membership in regulating church affairs for the time, and was extensively adopted as a *popular system* of church polity, the most popular that had, at that time, been proposed. It humbled the episcopacy, by restricting the bishops to the charge of parishes, and converting them into parish ministers; and it exalted the laity, by elevating persons from their ranks to the eldership, to constitute, with the ministers as moderators, all the primary church courts, and to sit with them in equal numbers in all the higher courts.

But, subsequently, a still greater elevation of the membership was proposed in the scheme of church independency and democracy. Not, however, till Presbyterianism had gained permanent and extensive establishments in Switzerland, France, Holland, Germany, Hungary and Scotland, and not till it had acquired numerous friends and supporters in England.

Presbyterianism is established as one of the great powers of the religious world. In all its great national establishments it has received a precise form, which it will not be easy to change.

Excessive conservatism is one of its faults, as it is the fault of all great national establishments in church and state. Annual or quadrennial elderships, or lay delegations in presbyteries and other church courts, are resisted as dangerous innovations, calculated to unsettle everything. The system, as it is, has stood its ground, and steadily advanced to new conquests and increased dignities and power, three hundred years and more from the time of its first establishment by Calvin; and it is proposed to hold it forever, and bring on the millennium with it.

The objections to it are the same as to all other modifications of Episcopacy, and all other despotisms. It is not scriptural. It is not the original, divinely-appointed plan of church organ

ization; which was purely democratic; and, secondly, it is not expedient. The democratic plan is safer and better. This appears from a critical examination of the New Testament on the subject; and it is still further illustrated by the history and fruits of Presbyterianism, and its condition and tendencies at the present time.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ORIGIN OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN SWITZERLAND, AND ITS FOUNDERS.

Ulric Zuingle, the founder of the Reformed church of Switzerland, was a cotemporary with Luther. He was born January 1, 1484, in Switzerland, less than two months after the birth of Luther. Like him, he received a remarkably thorough education in sacred and classical learning, and became a Roman Catholic priest at Glarus, in 1506, at the age of twenty-two. Here he employed much time, as Luther did at Erfurt, in the study of the Scriptures. He copied the Epistles of Paul in the original Greek, with his own hand, and is said to have learned them by heart. In 1512—1515 he accompanied the soldiers of his country, in the capacity of a chaplain, in the cause of the Pope against the French, for which he was rewarded with a pension.

In 1516 he became a preacher in the convent of Einsiedeln, a celebrated place of pilgrimage, where he began to protest against the errors of the Papacy, and to call on the bishops of that region to promote a reformation in the church; but without yet abandoning the Papacy, or thinking of forming an independent and rival church. In 1518 he received from the Papal legate the diploma of Acolyte Chaplain of the Holy See, as a reward for his Christian zeal, and laborious advocacy of Christianity.

He was transferred, soon after, to Zurich, where he became a preacher in the cathedral at that place; and, January 1, 1519, preached his first sermon there, in favor of the use of the *entire Scriptures* in public worship. His public arguments at different times on this subject prepared the way for the reformation in Switzerland.

He had previously opposed the sale of indulgences, in 1518, the year after Luther commenced his opposition to the same abuses. Such was the success of Zuingle's opposition to this iniquity, that the monk who had come to Switzerland for the purpose of selling indulgences was not allowed to enter Zurich. In these, and other views, he was supported by the bishop of Constance. In Zurich his proposed reforms met with such general favor, that, in 1520, the Scriptures were ordered to be taught without human additions. Two years later, in 1522, the reformation was extended to the disuse of many external ceremonies, and the adoption of simple and scriptural modes of divine worship.

In 1523 the magistrates of Zurich invited theologians who dissented from the views of Zuingle to a public discussion with him, for the purpose of eliciting the truth. About six hundred clergymen, and others, attended; and Zuingle exhibited and supported his views in sixty-seven propositions, with such force of argument as greatly advanced his cause.

The same year, 1523, Zuingle had a second public debate against images and the mass, in which he carried the general conviction of the people in his favor; and the use of both was abolished, by the authorities of the city, the same year. This debate was held in the presence of nine hundred persons.

Zuingle wrote and published extensively in favor of the reformation, and aimed to bring the church back as far as possible to the simplicity and purity of the apostolic times. Like Luther, he received the Bible as the only supreme rule of faith, and brought the general usages of those times to the test of Bible authority.

Zuingle became the head of the reformation in Switzerland, as Luther was in Germany; and he enlisted many powerful co-adjutors, both among the clergy and laity, in favor of his principles. But the movements of the great reformers were both original and independent, and they were characterized by some diversities of theological views, which tended to keep them separate, and occasionally to bring them into collision with each other.

With a view to come to a mutual understanding, at the suggestion of Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, a conference was held by Luther and Zuingle, together with some of their most distinguished friends and adherents, at Marburg, October 3, 1529.

Zuingle was in advance of Luther on the subject of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist; and, although they agreed on other points, they could not come to a perfect agreement on this. They parted, however, in friendship, and the conference was to the advantage of the common cause. They agreed in thirteen articles, expressing their common faith, and in the fourteenth agreed to differ in charity on the subject of the eucharist.

A war broke out between Zurich on one side, and several Catholic cantons on the other, and the Protestants had to contend with greatly superior forces; but, in their great zeal and confidence in the correctness of their principles, they thought it right and safe to make their appeal to the sword. They did so, and were vanquished, and many of their number slain. Among these was Ulric Zuingle, the *morning star* of the Swiss reformation.

He was called, agreeably to the usage of the times, of committing the standard to the hands of an ecclesiastic, to carry the banner; and fell on the battle-field, in the discharge of this duty, October 5, 1531, in the forty-seventh year of his age. He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual. It would have been much better had the Zurich Christians submitted till it might

have been in their power to carry their points by arguments and moral influence. On this arena the better cause has the better chance.

But, though its illustrious leader and standard-bearer was removed, the church of God which he had contributed to found remained firm. The Zuinglian polity was left incomplete. But God was preparing a mighty master to enter into his labors, and prosecute them to a most glorious result, not only for Switzerland, but for the world. That great instrument of Divine Providence, that was raised up to complete the Swiss reformation, and make it one of the great lights of the world, was *John Calvin.*

John Calvin was born at Noyon, in Picardy, France, July 10, 1509. His father was a cooper; but he was early dedicated to the church, and received an education suitable to that object. At twelve years of age he received a benefice in the cathedral of Noyon, and was appointed to others at eighteen, and at a later period, while studying at Paris. Before completing his education, he became imbued with the doctrines of the reformation, which were then being received in France; and concluded to renounce theology for the law, which he studied first at Orleans, and then at Bourges.

In 1532, at the age of twenty-three, he returned to Paris, resigned his benefices, and published a Latin commentary on two books of Seneca, a distinguished Roman moralist. The next year he was obliged to flee from Paris, on account of being supposed to have assisted the rector of the university in composing an offensive discourse favorable to the reformation. Directly after this he commenced the preparation of his Christian Institutes, his great work on Christian theology. He travelled considerably, and soon commenced publishing against the Papacy, and in favor of the Reformation, allowing no vows and no sacraments but those of baptism and the Lord's supper, and denying the Papal supremacy.

On his way from Paris to Basle, in 1536, he stopped at Geneva, and was persuaded by Farell and others to take up his

residence there, and become a co-laborer with them in the reformed church of that city.

William Farell, at this time one of the leading pastors of the Reformed church of Geneva, was himself a native of France, and at first a Roman Catholic priest. He was obliged to leave his country on account of his reception of the doctrines of the reformation in 1533, when he went to Geneva, and became one of the pastors of that city.

On settling at Geneva, Calvin devoted himself principally to giving theological instruction, and was preëminently a religious teacher.

A violent opposition being excited against the reformed pastors in 1538, they were all banished; when Calvin went first to Berne, and then to Strasburg, where Bucer had introduced the reformation ten years before. Bucer was in the Lutheran connection. Calvin was received here with great kindness, and appointed professor of theology in the university. At the same time he had leave to erect a French church for the benefit of refugees from France in that city.

In 1541 Calvin was recalled to Geneva, and a deputation was sent to the authorities of Strasburg, to bring him back. Accordingly, after attending the diet at Frankfort, and the conference at Ratisbon, he returned and resumed his labors at Geneva in 1541.

He soon after his return submitted to the city council a draft of his plan of church government, which was immediately adopted and published. This was the commencement of Presbyterianism. Calvin was its author, and Geneva its cradle.

From Geneva, the Presbyterian polity was copied into the other reformed churches in Switzerland; and from Switzerland it was carried into other countries, near and remote. The high European reputation of Calvin as a scholar and theologian tended to conciliate favor to his scheme of church polity, and also to his peculiar theological views.

Calvin continued to exercise the pastorate at Geneva from

1541 till his death in 1564, twenty-three years, when he rested from his labors, at the age of fifty-five, having attracted to himself and his writings the profound attention of the Christian world. During his settlement at Geneva his labors were abundant. He preached almost daily, delivered theological lectures three times a week, attended numerous meetings of ecclesiastical bodies, and maintained an extensive correspondence with the leading reformers throughout Europe.

His salary was barely sufficient for his support; and his entire property at his death is said not to have exceeded two hundred dollars. He was a great jurist, an able politician, the first Biblical scholar and theologian of his age, and the founder of an extensive and powerful order of Christian churches. The Presbyterian churches are the most illustrious monuments to the memory of this great man.

His system of theology embraces the five points which have been so much debated since his time: 1, Predestination; 2, Particular redemption; 3, Total depravity; 4, Irresistible grace, and 5, Perseverance of the saints.

Most of the Presbyterian churches originally embraced the Calvinistic theology in connection with his polity. This theology, however, was not original with him. He borrowed much of it from Augustine, bishop of Hippo in Africa, a distinguished father of the fourth century. Calvin became early familiar with them, and, being himself the most accomplished Latin scholar and author in Europe, contributed powerfully to introduce them, with the doctrines of the reformation, throughout the reformed churches. Among those of his own order he was, for a time, completely successful; but latterly the Calvinistic theology has undergone a considerable decline. Conditional predestination, general atonement, great and general depravity, but not total, resistible grace, and liability of saints to fall and perish, are at the present time among the most generally and strongly established doctrines both of Protestant and Catholic Christen-

dom. The opposite doctrines, however, of Calvin and Augustine, still have zealous and powerful supporters.

Calvin's Christian Institutes were, at the time of their composition, one of the ablest and most systematic and scientific expositions of dogmatic Christianity that had ever been written. They were composed in Latin, and are still a standard work on Christian theology. Besides his Institutes, Calvin wrote numerous commentaries on the books of the New Testament, which occupy the highest rank in that department of sacred learning. He was also the founder, and, during his life, the head of an academy of general and sacred learning at Geneva, in which he was assisted by Theodore Beza, which attained great distinction, attracted scholars from all parts of Europe, and exerted a powerful influence in giving credit and authority to the doctrines of the reformation.

For many years since, the Presbyterian church of Switzerland has greatly declined from its adherence to the Calvinistic doctrines, and has not only gone over to Arianism, but has gone far beyond, to Unitarianism and humanitarianism. There is still a portion of the Swiss church however, which persists in an adherence to its earlier faith; and a revolution is believed to be in progress, in that country, in favor of a return to those principles, or a near approximation to them.

CHAPTER IV.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN FRANCE.

France was the first country to receive the doctrines of the reformation, after Germany and Switzerland. They met with great opposition here, but they gained many adherents. Francis I. occupied the throne from 1515 to 1547, thirty-two years, and was a distinguished patron of learning. This circumstance

induced learned men of distinction, favorable to the reformation, to take up their residence in that country; and the writings of the reformers, as men of learning, early attracted attention there. The university of Paris declared against the doctrines of Luther in 1521, yet his doctrines from the first had many friends in France. The first reformatory movement in France was at Meaux, under the patronage of the learned and pious bishop of that city, William Brissonet, in 1533. The movements of this prelate attracted the attention of the parliament, and the principal actors were banished, one of whom was William Farell, subsequently one of the pastors of Geneva in Switzerland.

John Leclerc, preacher of the new congregation at Meaux, having denounced the Pope as Antichrist, was beaten with rods, branded with a hot iron, and banished. He afterwards died a martyr at Mentz, and his congregation were scattered by persecution far and wide through the country. The bishop of Meaux, terrified by the resentment of the king, retracted, and condemned the reformed doctrines. LeFever and Roussel, and other prominent advocates of the doctrines of the reformation, retained their connection with the Catholic church under the protection of Queen Margaret sister of Francis, and resided at Navarre, where they greatly promoted the reformation.

In the mean time, Francis sent for Margaret, and rebuked her for suffering these innovations. She then demanded the following reforms: 1, That no mass should be said unless there were persons to receive it; 2, That there should be no elevation of the host as an object of worship; 3, That the Lord's supper should be administered in both kinds; 4, That no mention should be made of Mary and the saints in this service; 5, That common bread should be used in it; 6, And that the priests should not be bound to a life of celibacy.

These demands, however, were rejected, and her favorite ministers thrown into prison, from which they were released with difficulty by her intercession. At length the king was induced to forbid all innovation, and to punish all innovators with im-

prisonment and death; in consequence of which, great multitudes perished.

This persecution was continued under the reign of Henry II., who succeeded his father, Francis I., 1547, and occupied the throne till 1559, twelve years. He was a more violent and determined persecutor than his father. In 1551, the civil courts were required to coöperate with the spiritual, to exterminate all heretics. The estates of all emigrants on account of religion were ordered to be confiscated. No books were allowed to be imported from Protestant countries; and none published. In 1555, the civil courts were not allowed to admit any appeals from the church courts, and all the civil magistrates were commanded to execute the decisions of the church courts. The parliament refused to register this decree, and protested against it. In 1557, the king appointed commissioners to aid the bishops in exterminating heretics. But parliament refused to register this decree, and several of the courts favored and protected Protestants; in consequence of which, several judges were imprisoned, and some put to death.

The Protestants still multiplied. Two princes of the royal family, the king of Navarre and the prince of Condé, and a great number of the nobility and gentry, became their friends and patrons. They now formed churches on the Presbyterian plan, and settled ministers. The French Protestants held their first national synod in 1559, five years before the death of Calvin. They adopted a confession of faith, catechism, and directory for public worship, composed by Calvin. Their doctrines were strictly Calvinistic, and their church polity entirely Presbyterian.

Single churches were governed by courts composed of the pastor and elders. From these primary courts, appeals were allowed to higher courts, composed of pastors and elders, and meeting twice a year. From these courts, appeals were allowed to the provincial synods, composed of all the presbyteries in a province, and meeting once a year. Over all was a national

assembly composed of one pastor and one elder from each of the sixteen provincial synods. The national assembly did not meet annually nor statedly, but met as occasion required; and, at each meeting, some provincial synod was deputed to call the next meeting. From A. D. 1559 to 1659, one century, there were twenty-nine national assemblies, making an average of a little more than one for every four years. The general assembly was the supreme court of the church.

Francis II., a youth of sixteen, succeeded his father, Henry II., in 1559. His mother, Catherine de Medicis, the Duke of Guise, and other zealous Catholics, controlled his administration; and the Protestants, though supported by the king of Navarre, the prince of Condé and Admiral Coligni, were exposed to violent persecutions. Many were imprisoned, many were plundered of their property, many lost their lives, and many fled from the country. Francis II. was the first husband of the unfortunate Mary Stuart, queen of Scotland. He died 1560, after a reign of seventeen months, and was succeeded by his brother, Charles IX., aged nine years. His mother, Catherine de Medicis, ruled the kingdom without assuming the title of regent, and Charles continued on the throne till 1774.

At the accession of Charles IX., in 1560, the Protestants were too powerful to be despised. The court accordingly issued a decree releasing the imprisoned Protestants, and allowing toleration of all who would externally conform to the established religion. The provincial authorities favorable to the Protestants carried this law into effect, and others did not. In 1561, an attempt was made to effect a compromise between Catholicism and Presbyterianism, but without success. Civil wars followed; Presbyterians fighting for their existence, and Catholics for their extirpation. Peace was concluded, and the war renewed at different times, with great loss of life on both sides, till in 1570, the Presbyterians triumphed, and secured a complete amnesty for the past, and free toleration for the future.

Failing to accomplish their object by open and honorable war-

fare, the Catholic party now resorted to the most diabolical and infamous stratagem that is recorded in the annals of human wickedness, for the accomplishment of their wishes. The court pretended to submit to necessity, executed the treaty with much zeal, and professed all kindness for its Presbyterian subjects. A marriage was proposed between the young king of Navarre, the head of the Presbyterians as a political party, and the sister of the reigning king. At length, Coligni, the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, were all induced to appear at court. This was preliminary to an attempt to crush the power of the Presbyterians by a single act of wholesale assassination.

Everything being in readiness, on St. Bartholomew's eve, Aug. 22, 1572, agreeably to an order of the king, now twenty-three years of age, and the queen-mother, the infamous and execrable Catharine de Medicis, daughter of the noble family of the Medici of Florence, and niece of Pope Clement VII., the great bell of the palace began to toll at midnight. This was the preconcerted signal for the work of destruction to begin. Admiral Coligni, one of the most eminent soldiers of his day, was the first victim. Five hundred noblemen, and six thousand other Protestants, were murdered in Paris alone. A similar massacre was prosecuted everywhere throughout the kingdom. Not less than seventy thousand perished, and the Pope ordered a jubilee throughout Christendom, in honor of the event; an event of unparalleled infamy and atrocity, and an everlasting shame and reproach to the Catholic cause.

Charles died directly after, in 1574, in great agony of body and mind, aged twenty-five. Catharine died in 1587, aged sixty-eight, having brought incalculable miseries and misfortunes on her kingdom; and involved it, during her last years, in overwhelming disasters, the consequences of her wickedness.

The Protestants were greatly weakened by the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, but not crushed. They immediately rallied, and renewed the struggle for toleration.

On the death of Charles IX., in 1574, his brother, Henry

III., also a violent Catholic, assumed the government. He was obliged to give favorable terms to the Presbyterians, and to permit religious toleration everywhere, except in Paris. Among other concessions not less important, Presbyterians were to form half of each parliament. This concession, however, was only obtained as the result of another civil war. The Catholic party, being dissatisfied with this degree of toleration, civil war was again resumed, in 1577, and continued, with some interruption, till 1580, when the Protestants were again allowed their former liberties. War was again resumed in 1584; and Henry III. died in 1589, after a reign of sixteen years.

The king of Navarre a Presbyterian, was the next legal heir of the throne, which he assumed, under the title of Henry IV., and was supported by all his Protestant subjects, and opposed by the Catholics. To pacify his Catholic subjects, in 1595 he conformed to the Catholic church, but gave free toleration to Protestants; and, in 1598, he published the celebrated edict of Nantes, as the charter of the rights of his Presbyterian subjects.

In this decree he confirmed to them all the privileges ever conceded to them before; gave them equal rights and equal privileges, in the universities and public schools, with the Catholics; allowed them courts, half Protestant and half Catholic, in the principal cities; made them eligible to all public offices; allowed them to establish public worship in places of a particular description, throughout the kingdom; and allowed them an annual stipend of forty thousand crowns, for the support of their ministers.

The number of Presbyterians in France, at this time, is supposed to have been a million and a half. The number of churches reported to their synods was generally from seven hundred to eight hundred.

Some of them were very large, in the large cities, having from three to five pastors; while others were small. In many cases, the smaller churches united together, as is common in our times, having one pastor between them. They had men of great learn-

ing and talents, and maintained an intimate fellowship with the Presbyterian churches of Switzerland and Holland.

Henry IV. died in 1610, after a reign of twenty-one years; and was succeeded by his son, Louis XIII., a minor, under the regency of the Queen Mary of the Medici. Affairs being administered in an extremely arbitrary and unjust manner, the Protestants were occasionally goaded into rebellion, in consequence of which they ultimately became very much weakened. This result was brought about mainly by the agency of Cardinal Richelieu, for a long time prime minister of France, under Louis XIII.

Louis died in 1643, after a reign of thirty-two years. Louis XIV. succeeded him the same year, with Cardinal Mazarin, as the successor of Richelieu, for his minister. Both were devoted, and unscrupulous Catholics.

Louis XIV. was born Sept. 5, 1638; and acceded to the throne at the early age of five years. His mother was declared regent and guardian; and Cardinal Mazarin intrusted with the king's education, which however, was much neglected. Louis proclaimed his majority in 1651, at the age of thirteen; but Mazarin continued at the head of the government till his death, March 9, 1661. At this time the king was twenty-three years old; and from this time he reigned alone fifty-four years, without any prime minister.

His reign is one of the most remarkable in the annals of France, and was characterized with great splendor and magnificence. He engaged in many wars, and was one of the most powerful monarchs of his time. In his day he was accounted a *great king*, but history has not confirmed this title. His reign, however, was adorned with many great men, and his court was one of the most brilliant that the world has ever seen.

With boundless ambition, many personal graces, and excellent natural abilities, he was not a wise nor a good man. His last years were darkened with misfortunes, the consequences of his errors. His reign proved, on the whole, a source of incalculable evil to France. He extended the power of the monarchy to

absolutism, and began the great military system, still supported in Europe, of having immense standing armies. At the time of his death, 1715, at the age of seventy-seven, he left the nation involved in a debt of more than two billions of livres.

But the most infamous transaction of his reign, and one of the most injurious, was his revocation of the edict of Nantes, in 1685. One hundred and thirteen years after the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, all the chartered privileges of Protestants were revoked, and the Protestants required to conform to the Catholic church. This revocation of the edict of Nantes was preceded by sending soldiers into all parts of the kingdom, for the purpose of enforcing obedience by military executions. Protestant marriages were declared illegal; children invited to apostatize, and declared independent of their parents on doing so; and voluntary exile prohibited. The consequence was that the Presbyterian church, in France, was crushed; and nearly a million of Protestants left the kingdom. In this infamous procedure, Louis acted by the advice of the Jesuits, and the Catholic hierarchy generally; and was sustained by the court of Rome. So deep and damning was the corruption of that hierarchy, it knew neither justice, humanity nor mercy, but was the personification of hell itself.

From the time of the organization of the first synod in France, in 1559, to the publication of the edict of Nantes, in 1598, is thirty-nine years; from the publication of the edict of Nantes, to its recall, in 1685, is eighty-seven; in all, one hundred and twenty-six years. The conflict began as early as 1533, making twenty-six years more, which, added to one hundred and twenty-six, is one hundred and fifty-two years.

The revocation of the edict of Nantes, 1685, is supposed by some to have been the epoch of the slaying of the two witnesses, mentioned in Rev. 11: 7—13.

Some judge, however, that slaughter to be reserved for the year 1866. However that may be, Paris may well be called, at

this time, a spiritual Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified, v. 8, from the cruel persecutions that were enacted there, and its intolerable oppressions.

The protracted struggle of Presbyterianism for existence and power, in France, is one of the most remarkable events in history; and the two great measures by which it was crushed, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, in 1572, and the revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685, are without a parallel in any other country.

Why these enormous wrongs were permitted in the providence of God, are mysteries which human wisdom may not solve. I cannot but think that they indicate some displeasure, on the part of God, against the church, so scourged and abased, though by wicked hands.

Besides that, there was in the policy of the French Presbyterians too much reliance on the sword; and God left them to be an example of that proverbial declaration of Christ, to Peter, "Put up thy sword; for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword."

The Presbyterian church of France, from the beginning, took the sword, and worshipped God sword in hand. It possessed towns and fortresses. It fought its way up to power, held that power by force of arms, and lost it by the reverses above described.

The general character of the French Presbyterians corresponded to that of the English Puritans. They were called Huguenots; a title of uncertain origin, but supposed to denote primarily *confederates*, said to have been applied to the French Presbyterians as confederates opposed to the prevailing religious system.

They are described as the people whom Calvin founded, a people of peculiar character and habits, a kind of modern Spartans, who obeyed the laws of their ecclesiastical Lycurgus, and conformed to a severe moral and religious discipline. They were regarded as stern in their domestic habits, stiff and haughty

in their deportment in society, and of more than ordinary gravity and independence of character. They practised great industry and frugality, avoided the prevailing luxuries of the times, and practised great simplicity, both in their domestic arrangements, their customary pleasures, and their religious worship. Order and economy were among their leading characteristics.

These qualities naturally raised them to a superior condition in respect to wealth and power; and made them the envy of their poorer neighbors, on account of their superior condition.

Their merchants travelled extensively in the prosecution of commerce; their ministers visited foreign countries in the pursuit of knowledge, and were, many of them, the most eminent men of their time; and their artisans, mechanics and manufacturers, were at the head of their several crafts and arts.

In the earlier periods of their history, they favored republicanism in the state; and their own civil confederations were of a republican character. In all stages of their existence they were the natural and necessary enemies of civil despotism and oppression, as well as the enemies of vice and luxury. This fact made them particularly offensive to Louis XIV., and to his court; and contributed largely to instigate the various oppressive measures which were adopted against them by that monarch, and which led, finally, to the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the entire prohibition of their worship throughout the kingdom.

CHAPTER VI.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN HOLLAND.

Holland comprises seven of the seventeen provinces formerly denominated Netherlands. The Netherlands are now comprehended chiefly in the two divisions of Holland and Belgium. The fortunes of the Netherlands have been various, and their governments have undergone frequent revolutions. In the tenth century they were independent under one of the grandsons of Charlemagne. In 1443 they became subject to the dukes of Burgundy; and in 1519 fell under the power of Charles V., emperor of Germany. Not being able to endure the tyranny of Philip II., seven provinces of the Netherlands became independent, after a long and bloody conflict under a stadtholder, in 1570. The first stadtholder was William, prince of Orange. Frequent changes have been effected in the government since his time.

The reformation, from Germany and Switzerland, soon extended into the Netherlands. For a time it was doubtful whether the Dutch would join the Lutheran church with the Germans, or the Presbyterian with the Swiss and French. In 1571 they declared in favor of Presbyterianism, which they copied principally from the French; and published the Belgic confession, which was ratified by the synod of Dort in 1619.

The Dutch were Calvinistic in doctrines, as well as Presbyterian in respect to church order; as were also the Swiss and French. Their churches became numerous and prosperous. The university at Leyden was formed in 1575, and soon became famous throughout Europe; and its professors have been among the lights of Holland, and of the world. The entire population of the Netherlands in 1820, was 6,059,566; of whom

the regular Presbyterians were 1,650,000; remonstrants or Arminian Presbyterians, with other minor sects, 38,000, in all 1,688,000. Other denominations are somewhat numerous, particularly the Lutherans and Baptists; but half the entire population are Catholics.

The history of Presbyterianism in Holland is distinguished for the rise of Arminianism, and its organization as a distinct Presbyterian church, under the title of the Remonstrants. The propounder of these new views was James Arminius, a native of Holland, born 1560. He studied at Utrecht and Leyden, and so much distinguished himself that the magistrates of Amsterdam sent him, at the public expense, to complete his education under Theodore Beza, in the celebrated theological school of Geneva. Dissenting from the Aristotelian philosophy in some important particulars, Arminius gave so much offence to the authorities at Geneva, that he was obliged to leave that place; whence he went to Italy, and distinguished himself there as an eloquent and powerful preacher of the reformed religion. While undertaking to refute a work against the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, he became a convert to the opposite doctrine, and immediately began to preach that Christ died for all men, and that grace necessary to salvation was attainable by all. He became a professor of divinity in the university of Leyden, and promulgated his opinions both in his lectures and sermons. His opinions were received with favor by many; but a large number were greatly offended with them, and denounced them as most dangerous and fatal heresies, which ought by no means to be tolerated. Francis Gomarus, his colleague in the university, and one of its leading professors, opposed them with great violence.

The civil magistrates advised moderation, and thought that the new system might be tolerated, and the people be left to receive or reject it according to their discretion. Arminius was several times summoned to the Hague to give an account of his doctrines; and was subjected to great inconvenience and

disquietude. Several of the most eminent men of Holland embraced his views. But the clamors and objurgations of his enemies were violent and constant, and the gentle disposition of Arminius not adapted to such conflicts, allowed him to sink overwhelmed, a martyr to his opinions and to the violence and intolerance of his enemies, in 1609, at the age of forty-nine. But his opinions did not die with him, as they had not originated with him. They had prevailed, to a greater or less extent, in all ages, and were to be met with in all branches of the Christian Church, Catholic and Protestant. Arminius was only their more prominent expounder. After his death the agitation concerning his opinions was renewed, and numerous conferences and discussions were held on the subject.

To settle this controversy, a national synod was called by the states-general, or chief civil magistrate, to meet at Dort. In this measure the provinces were not unanimous. Four of them were in favor of it; three, Holland, Utrecht and Overyssel, were opposed to it. Barnveldt objected to the synod, as not called by a proper authority; urging that the states-general had not even the power of convoking a common synod, much less a national one.

The synod of Dort met, however, in November, 1618, and continued its sessions till the next year. The country was divided in respect to politics. Barnveldt, the grand pensioner, was of one party; Maurice, prince of Orange, with the established church, and a majority of the people, were of the other. Maurice is supposed to have enlisted in the contest against the Arminians for the purpose of injuring his political opponents, and advancing his own political views. He was desirous to be made count of Holland; and ecclesiastical disputes have often and often in Europe, been subordinated to political aims.

Everything was so arranged by the provincial synods as to place the Arminians in the power of their enemies. Some ministers were deposed for Arminianism; and the entire delegation to the national synod was anti-Arminian, with the exception of

two delegates from the province of Utrecht. Before this body Simon Episcopius, professor of theology at Leyden and other prominent supporters of Arminianism, were cited to defend their doctrines.

The Arminians were not allowed to disprove the opinions of the other party, but were restricted simply to the defence of their own. They complained of this as an unnecessary and improper abridgment of the liberty of debate, and as a departure from pledges given them, "That they should have liberty to propose, explain and defend their opinions, as much as they should judge necessary." They judged it necessary, for the defence of their opinions, that they should be allowed to impugn the opinions of their adversaries.

Not being allowed this full liberty of defence, the Arminians refused to make any defence at all. They were consequently dismissed from the synod, and their opinions examined and decided upon from their published writings. The synod were assisted in their deliberations by delegates from England, and other foreign countries. The result was the triumph of Maurice and his party, and the condemnation of Arminianism. The Belgic confession and Heidelburg catechism were confirmed; the Arminians were judged enemies of their country and of religion, deprived of their sacred and civil offices, required to refrain from preaching altogether, and such as would not submit, sent into exile, and subjected to other severe punishments. The celebrated and venerable Barnveldt, was brought to the block at the age of seventy-two; the illustrious Grotius, thrown into prison, and subjected to various indignities; and the other Arminians were treated with great injustice and cruelty. Great numbers went into exile.

The main points in which the Arminians dissented from the Calvinists are five, and are called "the five points."

1, Predestination; 2, Particular redemption; 3, Total depravity; 4, Irresistible grace; and 5, Perseverance of the saints.

On all these points the Calvinists take the affirmative, and the

Arminians the negative. The Calvinistic party not only maintained their views as true, but as essential principles of orthodoxy; a rejection of which, was a rejection of the Gospel itself, and a fundamental corruption of Christianity, and therefore, on no account to be tolerated. The Arminians were not only judged to be in error, but to be in a *fatal error;* and were judged to be the enemies of their country and of religion, on account of that error alone. No fault was found with their practical religion.

The intolerant decision of the synod of Dort was received with general disapprobation throughout Europe, and operated unfavorably to the interests of Calvinistic theology, by the indignation and disgust which it excited. So far from interposing any obstacle to the prevalence of these opinions, it brought great reproach and discredit on the opposite system.

On the death of Maurice, in 1625, and the accession of his brother, Frederic Henry, the persecution of the Arminians was abandoned, and those in exile allowed to return to their country. Arminianism did not prevail extensively in Holland; but it passed over to England, and became general in the established church, the thirty-nine articles of their faith to the contrary, notwithstanding. It was adopted by the Methodists, and extensively promulgated with the other principles of their order; is the general doctrine of Episcopalians, and is received by many in all the principal churches of Protestant Christendom.

The decrees of the synod of Dort did not give satisfaction to the entire church at home; and the five provinces of Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Groningen and Guilderland, could not be persuaded to adopt them till 1651, after the lapse of thirty-three years. The Dutch Calvinists exulted in these decisions, as if they had obtained a great victory. In fact, they had committed a great wrong, and inflicted a wound on the cause of Christian charity and genuine piety, that more than two centuries have been insufficient to heal. Their church has not prospered since. That intolerance and bigotry were the order

of the day in those times, may be allowed to be plead in palliation of their fault in some degree; but nothing can excuse it or shield it from the general reprobation of more enlightened times. The charity which suffereth long and is kind, which vaunteth not itself, and thinketh no evil of its neighbor, can endure considerable diversities of opinion on religious subjects in its communions, and loves and esteems, even its *erring* brethren.

Since the synod of Dort religion has made little progress in Holland, and the Dutch Presbyterian church has commanded in no considerable degree the respect of foreign nations; neither has it made any great contributions to the improvement of the condition of the human race in modern times.

The Dutch Reformed, in 1529, numbered one million, six hundred and fifty thousand; and the Arminians, who are also Presbyterians in respect to church polity, numbered, at that time, with other minor denominations, thirty-eight thousand in that country.

How has it happened that Dutch Presbyterianism began so vigorous, and extended itself so rapidly for a time, to continue so long as it has done, in a state of dead conservatism? Alas! it has departed from God, and God has, in a measure, departed from it. It has fallen behind the wheels of Divine Providence, and behind the exigences of the church and world; and God must promote his cause and kingdom by more appropriate and suitable agencies!

The tendency to excessive conservatism is one of the general accompaniments of our fallen and imperfect humanity. We cannot be excessive in our adherence to God, truth, and right reason. But imperfection mingles with all that is human; age, and the support of the good, give it dignity and authority; and the spirit of indiscriminate and blind conservatism perpetuates and extends it.

Dutch Presbyterianism, in America, is maintained by the Dutch Reformed church of the United States, and is in the main, a faithful copy of its transatlantic original, as Old School

Presbyterianism is of its Scotch model, and of the English Presbyterianism of the Westminster assembly. It is Calvinistic in doctrine, and attaches great importance to its Calvinism. It has about three hundred churches, and a membership of about thirty-five thousand, but is not increasing with any considerable rapidity. In some places it is on the decline as an independent church order; and many of the Dutch Presbyterians are absorbed by the Old School. They have little affinity for the New School body.—Murdock's Mosheim, vol. III., pp. 435—447.

CHAPTER VII.

THE WALDENSES.

THE Waldenses, in the valleys of Piedmont, were led, by their proximity to the French and Swiss, to embrace their doctrines and church polity. They retained some of their ancient rules of discipline till 1630, when the greater part of them were swept off by pestilence. After this calamity, they obtained new teachers from France, who regulated all their affairs after the model of the French churches. In 1530 the Waldenses sent two of their ministers to Switzerland, to confer with the reformers, and ascertain their principles, both of doctrine and church polity. These commissioners visited Bern, Basle and Strasburg, and described their own faith and practice with great simplicity, in a written communication to Œcolampadius, at Basle.

In a council of theirs, in 1532, they adopted a confession of faith professedly setting forth the doctrines which they had held for four hundred years, yet manifestly departing from the views communicated to Œcolampadius, and leaning to those of Calvin.

The Waldenses were, at many different times, subjected to

violent persecution; especially in the years 1632, 1655 and 1685. The dukes of Savoy made war upon these people, and expelled them from their country, in 1686. Three years later, most of them returned, but some entire congregations remained abroad. These cruel persecutions were renewed in 1696; and those who survived these frequent and furious assaults owed their preservation to the intercessions of the Dutch, English and Swiss, with the duke of Savoy.

At the present time, the Waldensian churches are Presbyterian and Calvinistic. They are said to have thirteen parishes and twenty thousand souls in Piedmont. The descendants of those who settled at Wittemburg, in 1699, have ten parishes and sixteen thousand souls.

Presbyterianism was transplanted from Switzerland into Poland and Hungary. In the latter country it became extensively prevalent, and it continues still to flourish there.

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN ENGLAND.

Most of the early Puritans, in England, were friendly to Presbyterianism. But the fortunes of the reformation were very different there from what they were in other countries, in consequence of the defection of Henry VIII. from the Papal church. Parliament, at the suggestion of Henry VIII., annulled the authority of the Pope, and conferred on the king the supreme headship of the church in 1533; giving him most of the prerogatives previously exercised by the Pope.

This only changed the church in respect to the supremacy, not in respect to its doctrines or worship. It appears to have been the design of Henry VIII. to constitute the Anglican church,

differing from the Papal only in respect to the supremacy. In 1535, Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More perished on the scaffold for refusing to take the oath of supremacy in favor of the king. The king, with the aid of parliament, suppressed a great number of monasteries, and added their endowments to the revenues of the crown. He died 1547, and was succeeded by Edward VI., under ten years of age. During the minority of Edward VI., the Earl of Somerset being at the head of affairs, and being a zealous Protestant, he educated the prince in the Protestant faith, and concerted with Cranmer a general reformation of the church. Edward VI. died in his sixteenth year, July 6, 1553, and was succeeded by Mary, a daughter of Henry VIII. by Catharine of Arragon. Mary was a zealous Catholic, generally known as the bloody Mary, on account of her cruel persecutions.

Mary died in 1558, after an inglorious reign of five years, an object of detestation to her subjects and was succeeded by Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII. by Anne Boleyn. Elizabeth was violently opposed to the Catholics, who supported Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. Elizabeth adopted Protestantism as the religion of the country; and parliament again abolished the papal supremacy January 25, 1559. This was the foundation of the present church of England. Elizabeth received the supremacy of the church, as Henry VIII. had done; and the oath of supremacy being required of all members of the house of commons, teachers, lawyers and clerks, in 1563, the Puritans separated from the national church. It does not appear, however, that they immediately organized dissenting churches; and, when they came to organize, they adopted, in the first instance, the Presbyterian system, which had already obtained extensive prevalence in Switzerland and France, and had recently been adopted in the national church of Scotland (1560).

The first Presbyterian Church in England was organized secretly at Wandsworth, five miles from London, in 1572, in the fourteenth year of the reign of Elizabeth. Other Presby-

terian churches were organized subsequently, in different parts of the country. But most of the clergy, and others who favored Presbyterianism, continued in the church of England, hoping to reform it, and remodel it on the Presbyterian plan. In 1586, more than five hundred ministers in the church of England are said to have favored Presbyterianism. This change in the public mind, and among the ministers and laity of the established church, in favor of Presbyterianism, continued till the end of the reign of Elizabeth in 1603, through the reign of James I., to 1625, and into that of Charles I., till 1642, when Episcopacy was abolished by act of parliament, and the next year, 1643, the Westminster assembly was convened by act of parliament, to settle the religion of the country on a new basis. The Westminster assembly was so called from Westminster, the place of its meeting. Westminster is now united with London, and forms a part of that city. Formerly it was separated from it.

The Westminster assembly consisted originally of a hundred and twenty-one divines, and thirty lay members. They were appointed by parliament to aid them by their advice in regulating the doctrines and polity of the church of England. Its sessions were continued for several years. The members of the Westminster assembly differed among themselves in regard to church polity; some of them being Congregationalists, and some Episcopalians, but the great majority of them were Presbyterians.

Not long after this assembly met, the general assembly of the Scotch church, at the request of the English parliament, sent four commissioners to join them, on condition that the Westminster assembly and parliament would take the solemn league and covenant, and agree to establish one uniform religion throughout the three kingdoms. The parliament reluctantly assented to this condition, but did so for the sake of securing the coöperation of the Scotch in their political designs. After the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, the solemn league and covenant were adopted; and, in February, 1644, the assembly, by

the order of parliament, drew up an exhortation to the people of England to join them in this assent. Through the Westminster assembly parliament licensed preachers, and directed all ecclesiastical affairs. The assembly composed a directory for public worship, which was sanctioned by parliament January, 1645; and the same year they composed a directory for the ordination of ministers, and for church government and discipline.

After a long and earnest debate, a majority of the assembly declared for Presbyterianism as of *divine institution;* but parliament voted for it only as lawful and agreeable to the word of God. The assembly also put the supreme ecclesiastical power wholly into the hands of the church courts; but parliament imposed restrictions, and allowed an appeal from the highest church court to parliament, thus putting the church under the supreme control of parliament. This gave great offence to the Scotch, and to most of the English Presbyterians. In 1646, the king being in the hands of the Scotch, the English Presbyterians determined to enforce Presbyterianism on all England. Parliament ordered ruling elders to be chosen in all the churches, and also ordered the establishment of presbyteries, synods, and the general assembly.

The Presbyterians determined that this system should be supported, and all others prohibited by law. For this purpose, a strong address was presented to parliament by the mayor, aldermen and common council, of London. The Congregationalists procured a counter petition from numerous artisans of London. On the question of toleration parliament differed from the Westminster assembly; and this difference led, in its ultimate results, to the subversion of the Presbyterian establishment.

Parliament, on being desired to establish Presbyterianism by divine right, and to prohibit all other orders, demanded Scripture proofs of this right. The search for these produced long and warm debates in the assembly, when the Congregationalists, and those who sympathized with them, withdrew, leaving the Presbyterians as the sole members of that body. Their number was

now reduced to fifty-three, when they voted, with one dissenting voice, that Christ has appointed a church government distinct from the state, but were afraid to report their views on other questions referred to them by parliament. In the mean time, the Presbyterian ministers of London met at Zion college, and fully answered the questions of the house of commons, maintaining in strong terms the divine right of Presbyterianism. In a second meeting they agreed to accept the limited Presbyterianism that had already been established by parliament.

This consisted of church sessions, presbyteries, synods, and a national assembly, with an appeal to parliament, making parliament in reality, though not in name, the highest church court.

The province of London was now divided into twelve presbyteries, containing one hundred and thirty-eight churches. The next year, 1647, provincial synods met in London and in Lancashire. These courts were not established by law in any other counties. The provincial synod of London continued to meet semi-annually, eleven years, from 1647 to 1658, the close of the protectorate of Cromwell.

Similar conventions were held among the Presbyterians in other parts of England during this interval, but without the sanction of the law, and without any direct connection with parliament as a supreme court of appeal. The Westminster confession of faith was approved by the house of commons, with some amendments, in 1647. But the house of lords, objecting to the articles on church government, gave their sanction to the doctrinal part of the confession only, in 1648.

The assembly's shorter catechism was presented to parliament in 1647, and the larger in 1648. Both were allowed to be used by authority of parliament. After the completion of the confession of faith and of the two catechisms, the Scotch commissioners returned home. The assembly, however, continued its sittings, but did nothing further of importance.

The army, being composed mostly of Congregationalists, and men who sympathized with them, demanded of parliament the

free toleration of all Protestant dissenters, contrary to the new constitution. The Presbyterians opposed this, and parliament endeavored to relieve itself by disbanding the army. But the army refused to be disbanded, and continued to insist on its demand for the free toleration of all Protestant dissenters. In 1648, the Scotch, having made a separate treaty with the king, invaded England, in order to rescue him; and while the army was engaged in this war, the Presbyterians seized the opportunity to enforce Presbyterianism. An act was proposed declaring eight specified heresies to be capital crimes, and sixteen others punishable with unlimited imprisonment; but did not pass. In June following, an act passed placing all parishes and places whatsoever in England, and Wales, under the Presbyterian government, without allowing any other worship, yet without making it a penal offence to neglect this worship. Negotiations were also opened with the king for his restoration, on the basis of a single religion, with no toleration of any other church order. The king insisted on Episcopacy, and the parliament on Presbyterianism. The army now finding that free toleration was not to be allowed by either the Royalists or the Presbyterians, seized the king, sifted the house of commons, caused the king to be impeached and beheaded, and established the commonwealth, under Cromwell. Scotland refused to acknowledge the commonwealth, recognized Charles II. for their king, and threatened war with England for the purpose of establishing Charles II. on the throne. The English Presbyterians took sides with the Scotch, disowned the parliament, and declared, as they had heretofore done, against free toleration of Protestant dissenters.

All were now required to swear fealty to the new government; which some of the Presbyterians refused to do, and were turned out of their offices. To conciliate the Presbyterians, however, parliament continued the Presbyterian church establishment, but repealed all acts compelling uniformity, and allowed unlimited dissent.

The Scotch, having invaded England, were vanquished, and

all Scotland was compelled to submit to parliament, and to allow free toleration of dissent in their country, the same as it was allowed in England. The solemn league and covenant was now set aside, and ministers only required to promise obedience to the laws of the land, to enjoy any living in the church, or any civil office. Hence, many Episcopal divines, and those of other denominations, became parish ministers.

In 1653 the army put an end to the parliament, which had now been sitting twelve years, and the last four had ruled without a king or house of lords; and the government of the country was devolved upon Cromwell, aided by a council of state of one hundred and forty men, acting as representatives of the people. After five months, these representatives resigned their power to Cromwell, who framed a new constitution, with a single house of representatives, chosen in the three kingdoms, and a protector elected for life, with ample executive powers. All sects, except Papists and Episcopalians, had free toleration.

Ministers of different denominations now began to form associations for mutual counsel and advice. But the more strict Presbyterians and Episcopalians did not take any part in them.

The right of licensing and ordaining ministers had been, for some years, exclusively in the hands of the Presbyterians. Cromwell changed this, by appointing, in 1654, a board of thirty triers, composed of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and three Baptists, to license preachers throughout all England. The same year he appointed lay commissioners in every county, with full power to eject incompetent and scandalous ministers and schoolmasters. Both these ordinances were confirmed by parliament.

The Presbyterians, seeing no prospect of obtaining the supremacy under the protectorate, united, after the death of Oliver Cromwell, with the royalists, in 1659, in order to restore the king. He had engaged to respect Presbyterianism in Scotland, and they thought he would be induced to do the same in England. The remains of the Long Parliament were collected and placed over the nation, and the members excluded from it

in 1648 were recalled and took their seats, giving the Presbyterians a majority in that body.

This parliament voted that the concessions offered by the king in 1648 were satisfactory; restored Presbyterianism, with the solemn league and covenant; appointed a new council of state; ordered that a new parliament should be chosen, and then resigned its powers, and adjourned indefinitely. The Presbyterians, who had the whole power of the country in their hands, were so zealous to prevent the election of republicans, that the new parliament, when it assembled, was decidedly favorable to royalty. This parliament recalled the king, without making any stipulations with him respecting religion. He directly restored Episcopacy, and prohibited all dissent. The Presbyterians had the most to lose, and they lost everything. Many hundreds of their ministers were immediately displaced, to make room for previous incumbents, and to clear the way for government episcopacy.

In 1662 the act of uniformity made it criminal to dissent from the established church, and exposed all dissenters to persecution. Some Presbyterian ministers conformed, and retained their places; but more than two thousand, most of them Presbyterians, were turned out, and many of them, with their families, reduced to the greatest distress. This persecution continued till the revolution, and accession of William and Mary, in 1668; exposing Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and other dissenters, to the greatest inconveniences; breaking up their organizations, scattering their members, and blighting, apparently forever, the prospects of this order in England. After the revolution of 1688, toleration was obtained. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists immediately renewed their organizations, but the glory and strength of their previous years had departed. The English Presbyterians, however, were effectually cured of their intolerance; and one of their first acts, after the reëstablishment of toleration, was to form a friendly union with Congregationalists, for the purpose of coöperating together.

The act of uniformity of 1662 required all clergymen to use

the liturgy, and to swear to renounce and condemn the solemn league and covenant, Presbyterian ordination, and all efforts to change the present establishment. At the same time, all the old laws against conventicles, neglect of the parish churches, &c., were revived, exposing the non-conformists to civil prosecution, and making them liable to various punishments.

The Presbyterian system is a compromise between the absolute despotism of the clergy and the government of the church on democratic and republican principles. Episcopacy is church despotism, the governors being above the church and over it, and deriving their powers from their predecessors in the same or higher offices, but not from the church. Presbyterianism is the lowest conceivable grade of church despotism, the ministry sharing the government of the church with an eldership appointed by the laity, and holding their office for life. Congregationalism is church republicanism; the church attending to its own affairs in church meetings, or transacting its business by agents and committees of its appointment, all of which are accountable to itself. In the Episcopal and Presbyterian systems power is transmitted by the rulers, and derived from them; in the Congregational system, it is conferred by the church, under such limitations and restrictions as it sees fit to impose, and as circumstances may demand.

It has been a matter of surprise and grief to many, that the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of the time of Cromwell should have differed so widely, and have refused to coöperate together for the attainment of a common interest. Could they have done so, these systems might have secured a permanent ascendency vastly to the advantage, apparently, of that country, and of the kingdom of Christ generally. But they did not; perhaps they could not. The Presbyterians desired to subject the church to the government of ministers and elders, as much as the Episcopalians did to that of bishops. They, equally with the Episcopalians, desired a government above the church, not of it. The main difference between them was that Presbyterian

government was not placed so far above the church as the Episcopacy. The Episcopal governor was a bishop; the Presbyterian governor was an elder. Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, therefore, so far agree in principle. The Presbyterians were not further from the Episcopalians than the Congregationalists were from the Presbyterians.

Besides, the Presbyterians were, equally with the Episcopalians, devoted royalists. They were so in agreement with their church polity. The Congregationalists were equally devoted republicans. So that, if we consider the subject more thoroughly, we may see that it is no more strange that the Presbyterians did not make common cause with the Congregationalists, than it is that the Episcopalians did not make common cause with the Presbyterians. The Presbyterians attached as much importance to parish eldership as the Episcopalians did to diocesan episcopacy. The Congregationalists discarded both for the government of the church by itself, by its direct authority, or on the principle of representation.

The Presbyterians, in the time of Cromwell, are not to be blamed for supporting their own system; but they are to be blamed for not being willing to tolerate Congregationalism, and other systems. They shared this error in common with all the great Christian orders in those times, but it was an error still. This error, together with their friendship for royalty, wrought their ruin.

Their intolerance of other orders arrayed all other orders against them, in a struggle for their existence, and united all other orders to coöperate together to accomplish their overthrow. Their friendship for royalty, operating together with the opposition they encountered from the Independents, who had enjoyed the favor of the government during the ascendency of Cromwell, induced them to unite with other ill-disposed persons to recall the king, in 1660, on the abdication of Richard, Cromwell's son. But he was no sooner recalled than he established Episcopacy, and required universal conformity to episcopal

rule. The result was that Presbyterianism and Congregationalism were both, for the time, overwhelmed.

Charles II. was a contemptible tyrant. He was licentious, indolent and irreligious. During his reign, in 1665, London was visited with the great plague, which swept off one hundred thousand people. Grass grew in the streets, and the city of London presented the appearance of desolation.

The great plague prevailed in the summer of 1665. In the autumn of the same year, London was visited with the great fire, which raged uncontrolled for a week. This destroyed thirteen thousand two hundred dwelling houses, and eighty-nine churches; and the night was rendered as light as day, to the distance of ten miles around. This calamity was, in the end, a blessing, and led to great improvements in widening and straightening the streets, and in the introduction of new and superior styles of building.

On the accession of the prince of Orange, under the title of William III., the persecution of Presbyterians ceased; and it is interesting to observe that, in the very next year, the little remnants of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism that still survived, rallied, and these two orders united, for the first time, in a combination for the promotion of their common faith, under the title of "The union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists in London and vicinity." Since this time English Presbyterianism and Congregationalism have lived in amity.

Since the toleration of dissenters, in 1688, Presbyterianism has not flourished in England. It revived, in some degree, and some hundred churches were organized. But their state has been generally languishing, and many of them have become Unitarian. Congregationalism has fared much better in that country, and has become a considerable spiritual power.

The ruin of Presbyterianism in England, after it had risen to the point of becoming the sole established religion of the land, and had, for a time, displaced Episcopacy, to make way for itself, is scarcely less remarkable than its great misfortunes in France. And, in one respect, its fall in England is even more

remarkable than its overthrow in France. It was the victim of its own misguided policy, and fell in consequence of its own active exertions to cast down its Congregationalist competitors, and to exalt itself at their expense. And there it has been permitted to lie ever since, so far as England is concerned, a monument of the short-sightedness of man's wisdom, and of the terrific and awful power of God's retributive judgments; beginning even at his own house, his own churches, and blasting the hopes and expectations of his worshippers. It is the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes.

It is remarkable that the confession of faith produced by the English Westminster assembly, and ratified at the time by the English Parliament, should have answered so little purpose in England, and command such profound respect in Scotland and America, as almost to supersede the Bible itself as a rule of faith.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

This body is often referred to, and its doings noticed in the history of Presbyterianism in England; but its general relations to the events of those times, and its high authority among the numerous branches of the great Presbyterian family, in the times that have followed, entitle it to a more extended notice.

The ordinance calling this assembly, is dated June 12, 1643, and is as follows:

"An ordinance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament, for the calling of an Assembly of learned and godly Divines, and others, to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of Eng-

land, and for vindicating and clearing of the Doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations.

"Whereas, amongst the infinite blessings of Almighty God upon this nation, none is, or can be, more dear unto us than the purity of our religion; and for that as yet many things remain in the Liturgy, discipline, and government of the Church, which do necessarily require a further and more perfect reformation than yet hath been attained: And whereas it hath been declared and resolved by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that the present Church government, by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, depending upon the hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation and growth of religion, and very prejudicial to the state and government of this kingdom; and that therefore they are resolved that the same shall be taken away, and that such a government shall be settled in the church as may be most agreeable to God's Holy Word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches abroad: And for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit and necessary to call an Assembly of learned, godly, and judicious divines, to consult and advise of such matters and things, touching the premises, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and to give their advice and counsel therein to both or either of the said Houses, when, and as often as, they shall be thereunto required:

"Be it therefore ordained, by the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, that all and every the persons hereafter in this ordinance named, that is to say," [Here follow the names], "and such other persons as shall be nominated and appointed by both Houses of Parliament, or as many of them as

shall not be letted by sickness, or other necessary impediment, shall meet and assemble, and are hereby required and enjoined, upon summons signed by the clerks of both Houses of Parliament, left at their several respective dwellings, to meet and assemble at Westminster, in the chapel called King Henry the Seventh's Chapel, on the first day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and forty-three; and, after the first meeting, being at least of the number of forty, shall, from time to time sit, and be removed from place to place; and also, that the said Assembly shall be dissolved in such manner as by both Houses of Parliament shall be directed. And the said persons, or so many of them as shall be so assembled or sit, shall have power and authority, and are hereby likewise enjoined from time to time during this present Parliament, or until further order be taken by both the said Houses, to confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things touching and concerning the Liturgy, discipline and government of the Church of England, or the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false aspersions and misconstructions, as shall be proposed to them by both or either of the said houses of Parliament, and no other; and to deliver their opinions and advices of or touching the matters aforesaid, as shall be most agreeable to the Word of God, to both or either of the said Houses, from time to time, in such manner and sort as by both or either of the said Houses of Parliament shall be required, and the same not to divulge by printing, writing, or otherwise, without the consent of both or either House of Parliament.

"And be it further ordained, by the authority aforesaid, that William Twisse, Doctor in Divinity, shall sit in the chair, as prolocutor of the said Assembly; and, if he happen to die, or be letted by sickness, or other necessary impediment, then such other person to be appointed in his place as shall be agreed on by both the said Houses of Parliament. And in case any difference of opinion shall happen amongst the said persons so assembled, touching any of the matters that shall be proposed to them,

as aforesaid, that then they shall represent the same, together with the reasons thereof, to both or either the said Houses respectively, to the end such further direction may be given therein as shall be requisite in that behalf. And be it further ordained, by the authority aforesaid; that, for the charges and expense of the said divines, and every of them, in attending the said service, there shall be allowed unto every of them that shall so attend, the sum of four shillings, for every day, at the charges of the Commonwealth. at such time, and in such manner, as by both Houses of Parliament shall be appointed. And be it further ordained, that all and every the said divines, so as aforesaid required and enjoined to meet and assemble, shall be freed, and acquitted of and from every offence. forfeiture, penalty, loss, or damage, which shall or may arise or grow by reason of any non-residence or absence of them, or any of them, from his or their, or any of their, church, churches, or cures, for or in respect of the said attendance upon the said service, any law or statute of non-residence, or other law or statute enjoining their attendance upon their respective ministries or charges to the contrary thereof notwithstanding. And if any of the persons before named shall happen to die before the said Assembly shall be dissolved by order of both Houses of Parliament, then such other person or persons shall be nominated and placed in the room and stead of such person and persons so dying, as by both the said Houses shall be thought fit and agreed upon: And every such person or persons so to be named, shall have the like power and authority, freedom and acquittal, to all intents and purposes, and also all such wages and allowances for the said service, during the time of his or their attendance, as to any other of the said persons in this ordinance named, is by this ordinance limited and appointed. Provided always, that this ordinance, or anything therein contained, shall not give unto the persons aforesaid, or any of them, nor shall they in this Assembly assume to exercise any jurisdiction, power, or authority ecclesiastical what-

soever, or any other power, than is herein particularly expressed."

Parliament had passed an act, Sept. 10, 1642, that the prelatic form of church government should be abolished after Nov. 5, 1643; and the ordinance calling the Westminster assembly had passed Jan. 12, 1643. What government to adopt for the church, in future, was yet undetermined; and was to be determined by Parliament. The nation was divided in opinion on the subject. Many favored Episcopacy, many Presbyterianism, some Independency. The Westminster assembly was appointed to advise in the matter. It had no power to settle *anything* authoritatively. It was not a church court, or church legislature. It was simply a *parliamentary council* of advice. All the authority of its acts was derived from Parliament.

This appointment was by no means agreeable to the king, James VI. As successor of the Pope, in the headship of the English church, he claimed to be its undoubted and lawful sovereign; and demanded implicit subjection to his will in the church, as he did in the state. In both he ruled by divine right.

The ordinance calling the Westminster assembly embraced in its list of members ten lords, twenty commoners, and one hundred and twenty-one divines. About twenty-five did not attend, and, to supply deficiencies, an additional list of twenty-one were appointed. There were, in all, thirty lay assessors and one hundred and forty-two divines, but they never all met.

At the first meeting of the assembly, July 1, 1643, sixty-nine clerical members were present. The first business was to revise the thirty-nine articles of the church of England. After some weeks spent on this subject, the arrival of the Scotch commissioners was followed by the discussion of the Solemn League and Covenant of that nation; which, after full consideration, was adopted, both by parliament and the Westminster assembly, Sept. 25, 1643. It was subsequently subscribed extensively

throughout the kingdom. This remarkable document is as follows:

"THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT, for reformation and defence of religion, the honor and happiness of the King, and the peace and safety of the three kingdoms of Scotland, England and Ireland; agreed upon by Commissioners from the Parliament and Assembly of Divines in England, with Commissioners of the Convention of Estates and General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and by both Houses of Parliament, and the Assembly of Divines in England, and taken and subscribed by them anno 1643; and thereafter by the said authority, taken and subscribed by all ranks in Scotland and England the same year; and ratified by act of the Parliament of Scotland anno 1644. (And again renewed in Scotland, with an acknowledgment of sins and engagement to duties, by all ranks, anno 1648, and by Parliament, 1649; and taken and subscribed by King Charles II., at Spey, June 23, 1650; and at Scoon, January 1, 1651.)

"We, noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the Gospel, and commons of all sorts in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by the providence of GOD living under one king, and being of one reformed religion, having before our eyes the glory of GOD, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, the honor and happiness of the king's majesty and his posterity, and the true public liberty, safety and peace of the kingdom, wherein every one's private condition is included: And calling to mind the treacherous and bloody plots, conspiracies, attempts, and practices of the enemies of GOD, against the true religion and professors thereof in all places, especially in these three kingdoms, ever since the reformation of religion; and how much their rage, power, and presumption, are of late, and at this time, increased and exercised, whereof the deplorable state of the Church and kingdom of Ireland, the distressed state of the

Church and kingdom of England, and the dangerous state of the Church and kingdom of Scotland, are present and public testimonies; we have now at last (after other means of supplication, remonstrance, protestation, and sufferings), for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of God's people in other nations, after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a Mutual and Solemn League and Covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the Most High God, do swear,—

"I. That we shall sincerely, really and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavor, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion of the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches; and shall endeavor to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, Confession of Faith, form of Church government, Directory for Worship and Catechising; that we, and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.

"II. That we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (that is, Church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical offices depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms.

"III. We shall, with the same sincerity, reality, and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavor, with our estates and lives, mutually to preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments, and the liberties of the kingdoms; and to preserve and defend the king's majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms; that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminish his majesty's just power and greatness.

"IV. We shall also, with all faithfulness, endeavor the discovery of all such as have been, or shall be, incendiaries, malignants, or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the king from his people, or one of the kingdoms from another, or making any faction or parties among the people, contrary to this League and Covenant; that they may be brought to public trial, and receive condign punishment, as the degree of their offences shall require or deserve, or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, shall judge convenient.

"V. And whereas the happiness of a blessed peace between these kingdoms, denied in former times to our progenitors, is, by the good providence of God, granted unto us, and hath been lately concluded and settled by both Parliaments; we shall, each one of us, according to our place and interest, endeavor that they may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union, to all posterity; and that justice may be done upon the wilful opposers thereof, in manner expressed in the precedent article.

"VI. We shall also, according to our places and callings, in this common cause of religion, liberty, and peace of the kingdoms, assist and defend all those that enter into this League and Covenant, in the maintaining and pursuing thereof; and shall not suffer ourselves, directly or indirectly, by whatsoever combination, persuasion, or terror, to be divided and withdrawn from this blessed union and conjunction, whether to make defection to the contrary part, or to give ourselves to a detestable indiffer-

ency or neutrality in this cause, which so much concerneth the glory of GOD, the good of the kingdom, and honor of the king; but shall, all the days of our lives, zealously and constantly continue therein against all opposition, and promote the same, according to our power, against all lets and impediments whatsoever; and what we are not able ourselves to suppress or overcome, we shall reveal and make known, that it may be timely prevented or removed: All which we shall do as in the sight of GOD.

"And, because these kingdoms are guilty of many sins and provocations against GOD, and his SON JESUS CHRIST, as is too manifest by our present distresses and dangers, the fruits thereof; we profess and declare, before GOD and the world, our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins, and for the sins of these kingdoms; especially that we have not, as we ought, valued the inestimable benefit of the Gospel; that we have not labored for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not endeavored to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of him in our lives; which are the causes of other sins and transgressions so much abounding amongst us: and our true and unfeigned purpose, desire, and endeavor, for ourselves and all others under our power and charge, both in public and private, in all duties we owe to GOD and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation; that the Lord may turn away his wrath and heavy indignation, and establish these churches and kingdoms in truth and peace. And this Covenant we make in the presence of ALMIGHTY GOD, the Searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed; most humbly beseeching the LORD to strengthen us by his HOLY SPIRIT for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with such success, as may be deliverance and safety to his people, and encouragement to other Christian churches, groaning under or in danger of the yoke of antichristian tyranny, to join in the same or like association

and covenant, to the glory of GOD, the enlargement of the kingdom of JESUS CHRIST, and the peace and tranquillity of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths."

The leading pastors in the Westminster Assembly were the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, and the Erastians. The Presbyterians were much the strongest; the Congregationalists and the Erastians, the weakest. The Congregationalists were not numerous in this body. The most prominent of these were five, distinguished as the five dissenting brethren. These were Dr. Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Jeremiah Burroughs, William Bridge and Sydrach Simpson. Of these, Goodwin was the chief. and the most profound theologian; Nye the most acute and politic, and Burroughs the most gentle and pacific. Others supported independency, to the number of ten or eleven. These were all who went for independency. Occasionally they were supported in some of their views by a few others.

The Erastians arose in 1568, and were so called from Erastus, a physician at Heidelburg, who wrote on the subject of church government, and advocated the supremacy of the civil magistrate. His theory was, that all disciplinary power in the church and state belonged equally to the civil magistrate, as under the Jewish economy. The Erastian theory put the church in the power of the state.

After taking the solemn league and covenant, the assembly resumed the consideration of the thirty-nine articles; when, on the 12th of October, its attention was called by Parliament to various questions of church government and discipline. These calls were continued and repeated till the whole system of church organization and government was brought under review, and acted upon. Many of these points occasioned long and earnest debates, but they were all in succession decided in favor of Presbyterianism, and against any authority of the state in church matters. On the latter point, however, the opinions of the assembly were overruled by parliament, which claimed for itself supremacy in church matters.

On being reported favorably upon, and adopted by parliament, as expedient and consistent with the word of God, Presbyterianism was received as the religion of the country.

An ordinance for the appointment of ruling elders throughout the kingdom of England was passed Aug. 19, 1645. This was followed by a more complete ordinance on the subject, March 14, 1646. May 3d, 1647, the first general synod of London was held, attended by one hundred and eight persons, and the province of London was divided into twelve presbyteries. The assembly continued its sittings till Feb. 22, 1649, five years, six months and twenty-two days, having had one thousand one hundred and sixty-three sessions. It was then changed into an ecclesiastical committee, to examine and license ministers, and continued till March 25, 1652; when, at the dissolution of the long parliament, it broke up without any formal dissolution.

The principal labors of the Westminster Assembly were the construction of the confession of faith, adopted 1647; the shorter catechism, the same year; larger catechism, 1648, and the form of church government and discipline. The form of church government had been adopted earlier, in 1645 and 1646.

The Westminster book was never made the standard for England, but it was immediately adopted in Scotland, where it has continued to be a standard of Presbyterianism till now; and it was early adopted as a standard of American Presbyterianism, by the Presbyterians, and continues to hold its place as such in the two great denominations of Old and New School Presbyterians.

In respect to doctrines, it is highly Calvinistic; agreeing with the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, and with the Protestant confessions of that period generally.

Among other matters brought before the Westminster Assembly, was a scheme of the general union of all Protestants in favor of common Protestant Christianity. It was a sublime conception, but no considerable progress was made in the adop-

tion of measures to accomplish it. It was altogether too much for those times. And even now, but few, comparatively, can enlarge their charities and sympathies sufficiently to entertain the idea as at all practicable.

So far as England was concerned, the Westminster assembly, with all its labors, was a magnificent failure. It began with dignity; it ended in dishonor. It excited, for a time, the highest expectations of the nation, and of the world. In the end, all those expectations were disappointed. This was owing to various causes, but no inconsiderable cause of its failure to command the confidence and respect of the nation, was the disagreements and controversies that were carried on among its members.

It was an ill-advised measure to appoint persons of fundamentally different principles, to construct a common platform. The majority must preponderate, and the minority be overborne by numbers. It is not often that the erring, in such circumstances, can be convinced by arguments.

But a main difficulty was, that the laws of forbearance and mutual love, and of the essential rights of individuals and churches, were not understood. It was supposed, both erroneously and unfortunately, that the majority were to command the minority in respect to the manner in which they should serve God and administer the affairs of his kingdom.

CHAPTER X.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN SCOTLAND.

On the death of James V., king of Scotland, his infant daughter, Mary, then a few days old, was entitled to the crown. At six years of age she was affianced to Francis II., dauphin of France, and sent to be educated in that country.

This was the celebrated Mary, Queen of Scots. She did not return to her country till the death of her first husband, in 1561. During this interval of nineteen years, the country was governed by the queen dowager, Mary of Guise, and a succession of regents.

The doctrines of the reformation had been introduced into Scotland, and were spreading slowly; when, in 1546, Cardinal Beton, archbishop of St. Andrews, seized and burned at the stake George Wishart, a reformed preacher. This excited great indignation, and Norman Lesley, a young nobleman, surprised and killed Cardinal Beton, in his castle, and held possession of it fourteen months. During this time the reformed doctrines were preached freely at St. Andrews, by the celebrated John Knox, and others of like spirit and zeal.

On the reduction of St. Andrews by the assistance of the French, in 1547, John Knox and others were carried prisoners to France. Knox remained a prisoner at the galleys in France till 1549, when he was liberated and went to England, where he was first appointed preacher of Berwick, then of New Castle, and lastly made chaplain to Edward VI., in 1552. He was offered a bishopric, which he refused, as savoring too much of antichrist. On the accession of Mary, in 1554, he left England and sought refuge at Geneva, where he became acquainted with Calvin, and formed a strong attachment to that great reformer, and his systems both of doctrine and church polity. In 1555 he returned to his native country and resumed his labors there, for the promotion of the reformed doctrines. His labors were crowned with great success.

In July, 1556, Knox paid a visit to the English congregation at Geneva. He had been threatened with prosecution, but his enemies did not dare to lay hands on him. He was no sooner gone, however, than they cited him to appear before them, passed sentence of death against him as a heretic, and burnt him in effigy at Edinburgh. In 1558 he started on his return to Scotland, but was persuaded to wait for a time longer, when he

addressed his friends such letters of remonstrance against timidity and backsliding, that on the 3d of December, 1557, they entered into a solemn covenant that they would sustain the principles of the Reformation at all hazards. In 1558 the archbishop of St. Andrews resumed persecution; but the Protestants having become nearly half the nation, obtained protection from the queen regent.

In 1559 the queen regent summoned the reformed ministers to appear at Stirling, to answer for their conduct. They set out, attended by noblemen, and immense crowds of armed men. The queen regent was afraid to meet them, and dismissed them on condition that they would return peaceably to their homes. They did so. She then proceeded to the mockery of trying them in their absence, and condemning them as out-laws. This led to a civil war. After several contests, and after the accession of Elizabeth, who favored the Protestant cause, to the throne of England, the French who had come to the assistance of the Scotch government were expelled from the country, and a peace was negotiated, in 1560, by which Protestants were left at full liberty, and all religious disputes were committed to the adjudication of parliament. A full parliament assembled, abolished the Papacy, and established the reformed religion in its place in 1560. The first general assembly of the Scottish church was held in December of this year. At this meeting a Calvinistic creed, and the Presbyterian church polity, were adopted.

Queen Mary returned the next year 1561, refused to ratify the acts of parliament subverting the Papacy, and set up a chapel of her own. Knox had returned again to Scotland, in 1559, and participated largely in the struggle of the times. In 1565 Queen Mary, now twenty-three years of age and a widow, married Henry, Lord Darnly, a weak and insolent young man, who soon rendered himself odious to her and the nation. She had a son by him in 1566, who became James VI. of Scotland. The next year, 1567, Lord Darnly was murdered, and the queen married Bothwell. This induced the nobles to seize the infant James for

the purpose of securing his safety. A civil war ensued, in which the queen was made captive, compelled to resign her crown to her son, and confined in the castle of Lochleven.

Having made her escape, she renewed the war without success, and, fleeing into England, cast herself upon the clemency of Elizabeth. Elizabeth kept her a prisoner twenty-two years, and then caused her to be beheaded on a charge of treason. John Knox preached on the coronation of James VI., 1567, and died November 29, 1572, just after the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve in France, which he learned with great sorrow.

James VI. was, in Scotland, a zealous Protestant, though somewhat inclined to favor Episcopacy. He acceded to the throne of England after Elizabeth, in 1603, under the title of James I. In 1590 he made the following declaration in the general assembly of the church of Scotland: "I praise God that I was born in the times of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king of the sincerest (purest) kirk in the world. The kirk of Geneva keeps pasche and yule (Easter and Christmas.) What have they for them? As for our neighbor kirk of England, their service is an evil said mass in English. They want nothing of the mass but the liftings (the elevation of the host.) I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort your people to do the same; and I forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall do the same."

James VI. professed himself much attached to the church of Scotland, till April 1603, when he succeeded Elizabeth on the throne of England. Being established on the English throne, in October 1603, he appointed a conference between the Episcopalians and the English Puritans, with a view to settle their controversies. On the part of the Episcopalians he called nine bishops, and as many other dignitaries of the church of other grades; on the part of the Puritans, he called four divines from England, and one from Scotland. On the first day of the conference, the king consulted with the bishops alone; on the sec-

ond, with the Puritan divines; on the third day, with the bishops and deans. After this the Puritans were called in to be informed that everything was settled in favor of episcopacy. The Scotch entered into a solemn covenant to defend their doctrines and church order, in 1588. In 1637 an attempt was made to force Episcopacy and a liturgy upon them; and the next year, 1638, a new covenant was entered into for the defence of their religion.

James I. died in 1625, a mortal enemy of Puritanism, and a strenuous supporter of Episcopacy. From his first arrival in England, in 1603, he set himself to overthrow Presbyterianism in Scotland and to establish Episcopacy in its place. For this purpose he spoke contemptuously of the Presbyterians, as insolent men, and enemies of regal power, and nominated bishops to the thirteen Scottish bishoprics. In 1606 he obtained an act from the parliament at Perth declaring the king to have sovereign authority over all estates, persons, and causes whatsoever in Scotland; also, an act restoring the bishops to their ancient possessions, which had been annexed to the crown. This made the new bishops peers of the realm. The general assembly protested; but, in 1608, a convention claiming to be a general assembly, declared the bishops perpetual moderators of all the synods and presbyteries. An opposition assembly sat at the same time opposing this scheme. In the next year 1609, the bishops triumphed, and the next year 1610, the king extended their power by authorizing them to hold high commission courts. The same year 1610, an assembly was held at Glasgow, which sanctioned the right of the bishops to preside personally, or by their representatives, in all the church courts, in all cases of discipline and ordination.

All ministers, at their ordination, were required to promise obedience to their bishop; and all clergymen were forbidden to preach or speak against the acts of the assembly, or to advocate the parity of ministers. Three Scottish bishops, Spotswood, Lamb and Hamilton, were sent to England to receive episcopal

consecration from the English bishops, and they consecrated the rest. In 1617 James visited Scotland to promote the cause of Episcopacy, which met with violent opposition, and was progressing slowly. The next year, 1618, a general assembly at Perth appointed kneeling at the sacrament, confirmation by the bishops, and the observance of Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and Ascension-day. These ordinances were published by royal authority in 1621, and obtained, with great difficulty, and against great opposition, the sanction of the Scottish parliament.

Persecution succeeded, and many ministers were fined, imprisoned and banished by the high commission courts. During this period many Presbyterians emigrated to the north of Ireland and laid the foundations of Presbyterianism in that country.

Charles I. succeeded his father, James I., in 1625. In 1633 he compelled the Scottish parliament to invest him with all the ecclesiastical powers conceded to his father; and also, to confirm the laws of the previous reign respecting religion. On leaving Scotland he created a new bishopric at Edinburgh; and archbishop Laud drew up articles to regulate the royal chapel at that place, designing it to be a pattern for all cathedrals, chapels, and parish churches. Canons, and a liturgy, were now added, similar to those of the church of England. These being revised by the English bishops were imposed upon the Scottish nation, by proclamation; the canons in 1635, and the liturgy in 1636. The bishops attempted to enforce these without the authority of the general assembly, or of a Scottish parliament. This threw the whole nation into commotion. The nobles, gentry, and a large proportion of the people, united in a combined effort to resist these oppressions, and revived the national covenant of 1580 and 1590.

The king found it necessary to convoke a general assembly; but his commissioners finding this body unmanageable, dissolved it. The assembly, however, protested, and continued its sessions. It annulled the acts of six preceding assemblies; abolished episcopacy, condemned the articles of Perth,

the liturgy, the canons and the high commission court; restored the presbyteries, synods and general assemblies, and deposed all the bishops, except two, whom they allowed to officiate as parish ministers. A civil war now followed; but after a long series of conflicts and truces, the Presbyterians remained masters of the country. The king becoming involved in a war with his English subjects, the Scotch formed the design of establishing Presbyterianism throughout the entire kingdom; and the English parliament consented to this, with a view to secure the aid of the Scotch in their war with the king, 1642—1648.

Commissioners from the church of Scotland were now admitted to the Westminster assembly, and the Scotch had great influence in all the ecclesiastical affairs of England, till the ascendancy of Cromwell.

At their suggestion, the English parliament adopted, with some modifications, the Scotch national covenant, denominated the Solemn League and Covenant, and enjoined it on the whole nation. The Scotch strenuously opposed the toleration of any but Presbyterians in either country. This alienated the Congregationalists, who were now becoming numerous and powerful in England.

In 1651 Charles II. was crowned in Scotland, and swore to observe the Solemn League and Covenant. Soon after this, marching an army into England, he suffered a total defeat and fled in disguise to France. Cromwell brought the whole country to submission, under the Commonwealth of England, and allowed free toleration to all orders of Protestants.

At the restoration of Charles II. in 1661, the Scottish parliament rescinded all acts and covenants respecting religion, and allowed the king to settle the ecclesiastical constitution of the country at his discretion. He ordained Presbyterianism for the present, but afterwards ordained Episcopacy. Sharp, Fairfoul, Leighton, and Hamilton, were made bishops in 1662. Similar laws were enacted against dissenters in both countries, and the non-conformists subjected to great suffering. Charles

II. pursued this policy till 1687, when to favor Popery, he granted universal toleration.

During the reign of Charles II., the most determined efforts were made to establish Episcopacy in Scotland, and bring the whole nation to uniformity in the adoption of Episcopacy and the prohibition of all dissent. In the course of these endeavors hundreds of Presbyterian ministers were expelled from their livings and reduced to the utmost distress. The greatest barbarities were resorted to to bring the Scotch to submission, and it is stated on a monument in Grey Friars church-yard, that between the years of 1661 and 1668, eighteen thousand persons suffered death in Scotland, for their adhesion to the Presbyterian faith and order. The firmness of the Scotch in resisting these oppressions is honorable to them and to their church, and has been of great service to the cause of liberty. The infatuation of Charles II. in pressing Episcopacy on the Scotch, is in keeping with his singularly ill-judged devotion to arbitrary principles generally, and besides its essential injustice and impiety, was the greatest of political blunders. Injustice is always inexpedient. But the inexpediency of this religious crusade against all rational liberty, it would seem ought not to have been overlooked even by the most short-sighted politician.

On the accession of William, prince of Orange, at the revolution of 1688, the Scotch Presbyterian Church regained its liberties and prerogatives, and has continued to enjoy them till the present time. Previous to this time, however, many had emigrated to North America, and were on hand, prepared to assist in laying the foundations of Presbyterianism on the Western continent.

The Seceders.

This denomination was formed by secession from the church of Scotland, in A. D. 1733, when several preachers were ejected from their livings in consequence of their opposition to the law

of patronage. The ejected ministers formed themselves into an ecclesiastical court under the title of the Associated Presbytery. In 1827 they had nineteen presbyteries, and three hundred and thirty-three churches in Scotland. In the United States their order had in 1850, one general synod, thirteen presbyteries, two hundred and four churches, and nineteen thousand members.

Some other religious organizations have been established in Scotland, the principal of which are the Episcopalian and Congregationalist; but the most important is the Free Church, which was organized by a secession from the established church, in 1843. Nearly half the establishment united in this movement, and sustain themselves on the voluntary principle. The distinguishing principle of its organization is independence of the state.

The character of Scotch Presbyterianism was somewhat modified by the circumstances of its origin. It did not begin with the people forming churches, then church sessions, presbyteries, &c. It began with the clergy and nobility. The general assembly was instituted first, and the inferior courts organized by its authority. It was extremely exclusive in its policy. It would not fraternize with Congregationalism. It would not tolerate it. And since the adoption of the Westminster confession and catechisms, it has adhered to them as perfect and unerring standards of church faith and practice, which are on no account to be improved upon or departed from. Absolute conservatism in respect to church faith and order are as prominent elements of Scotch Presbyterianism, as they are of English Episcopacy or the Papacy. With the exception of the great Free church movement there is no progress in Scotland. All things remain as they were from the beginning; and the paramount object is to keep still, not to advance. The church has a great horror of change or innovation. This is undoubtedly carried to an extreme, and is the adoption of one of the worst elements of Papal superstition into Protestantism. Protestantism begins with innovation, and having proceeded thus far, it stops, sets

up its landmark, and declares against all further progress as leading to anarchy and infidelity.

Scotland has produced no Jonathan Edwards. It has made no new contributions to Christian theology. Its greatest lights have only reflected the light of Calvin, Knox, and the Westminster divines. Even the distinguished Chalmers is not an exception to this. A result so inauspicious is not from want of genius or learning, nor from want of piety, but from undue devotion to a system, and the virtual abrogation of free inquiry on religious subjects. Judgment is forestalled and put under the absolute dominion of authority; and tradition, that idol god of the Catholics, is reïnaugurated as supreme arbiter of truth among Scotch Presbyterians.

Notwithstanding these imperfections in Scotch Presbyterianism, the position of the Scotch churches is one of great dignity and usefulness. No national church, in modern times, has performed its duty better, or served its generation more ably and faithfully. And the effect of its ability and faithfulness appears in the dignified and exalted character of the Scotch people. Its Chalmers is not the greatest of men. He gave the world no new conceptions. He did not enlarge the field of knowledge or advance theology as a science; but he was an able expounder of the science as already laid down in the creeds and confessions of the church, and was able to wield it to good purpose as an instrument of religious cultivation and moral reform. The Scotch church is doing excellent service in the missionary cause, and some of its missionaries are among the most distinguished in the field. The Scotch metaphysicians have led the world for more than half a century in mental philosophy. While philosophy has run wild in Germany, and the most powerful German minds have been entirely misled from the paths of true discovery, to lose themselves in profitless speculations and refinements, the Scotch metaphysicians have pressed steadily forward in the path of observation, self-inspection, analysis and classification, putting down what they find and nothing more, and extended

the limits of useful knowledge in this direction. Piety and morality are generally prevalent in that country. Virtue is the rule, and vice the exception. As a fruit of their piety and order, the Scotch are generally above want. Famines are common in Ireland and in some other parts of Europe, but there are no famines in Scotland. The United States is overrun and oppressed with paupers imported from England, but none come from Scotland. They are not indigenous to that country. And if we inquire the reason why, it must be found in its religion.

That country has had its trials. It has passed through the fiery ordeal of severe persecutions. Its tribulations during its long struggles with its sovereigns, and its cruel persecutions and cruel wars, form one of the most affecting chapters in history. The resolute and heroic struggles of the church for its liberty, and the liberties of the nation, are creditable to the Scottish national character, and to the Christian religion. Scotland is a bright spot in the world. Piety, virtue, honesty, industry, wealth, prosperity and happiness, are widely diffused among all classes of its people. While it has few paupers and few criminals, it has many learned and excellent men, eminent lawyers, divines and general scholars; and has made important contributions to the advancement of learning in modern times. Its religion has been a great blessing to it, and that blessing has not been altogether kept at home. It has gone abroad on a mission of Christian philanthropy to remote parts of the heathen world, and carried its doctrines there as the great principle of human improvement and happiness. English Christians of all orders have done the same thing, and the wilderness of heathenism is budding and blossoming like the rose.

One of the ablest of the British Quarterly Reviews is the organ of Free Church Presbyterianism in Scotland.

It is to be hoped that the mission of the Scotch, in promoting the world's progress and the indefinite improvement of society, is not accomplished. There is much land yet to be possessed; and the ripened fields of the world call for laborers. Presby-

terianism has done much good; but it cannot, without further modification, meet all the vast demands of suffering and misguided humanity.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Several secessions and reörganizations of Presbyterianism have taken place in Scotland, since its first establishment in that country, in 1560. Of this description are the Associate and Reformed Presbyterians; who have maintained an independence for many years in Scotland, by the side of the establishment, and under its shadow, and extended themselves to other nations.

But the most important secession that has ever occurred in Scotland is that of the 18th of May 1843, which resulted in the organization of the free church of Scotland, in opposition to the government church. Dissatisfaction with the government authority and influences had existed for a long time, and several cases of a more than usually aggravated character having occurred, a large portion of the establishment was thoroughly aroused to resistance. But resistance in the establishment was vain. Not the least thing could be done. The members must submit or withdraw. The majority, as is usual, submitted; but a large proportion of the entire ministry and membership resolved, on a full consideration of the subject, to withdraw, and establish an independent ecclesiastical body. This secession comprehended several of the most eminent clergymen of the Scottish church, among whom were Doctors Chalmers, Gordon, Candlish and Welsh.

The time fixed upon for the secession was the meeting of the general assembly, May 18, 1843, and the public expectation

was excited in the highest degree. The meeting convened as usual, but with a much larger attendance of strangers than usual, drawn together to witness the event.

The lord high commissioner held his usual levee, previous to the opening of the assembly, in the ancient palace of Holyrood. It was an occasion of uncommon interest, from the fact that many who were in attendance that day, were there for the last time. Strong bonds were to be sundered, and tender ties broken; and the whole occasion was one of unusual solemnity.

From the palace of Holyrood the assembly went to the high church, to listen to the opening sermon from the last moderator, Rev. Doctor Welsh, the highly distinguished professor of church history. Doctor Welsh preached with great effect. After sermon, the assembly went to the St. Andrews' church, where its meetings were to be held, there to be organized for business. There was considerable distance between these churches, and the assembly went in procession to the church, where its meetings were to be held, led by the lord high commissioner, and cheered on their way with martial music, in token of the interest of the government in their procedure, and of its protection.

With the exception of the reserved seats, the St. Andrews' church was filled to overflowing, long before the arrival of the procession. The assembly entered and took their seats, and the lord high commissioner, with vice-regal pomp, as the representative of sovereignty, occupied his ecclesiastical throne. The feeling of the vast assembly was intense, and mostly in sympathy with the seceders. The silence of death pervaded the house. Doctor Welsh, as last moderator, opened the meeting with prayer. The next business in order was the calling of the roll. But, previous to the calling of the roll, Doctor Welsh rose, by previous arrangement, and read the protest that had previously been drawn up and signed by the disaffected party, setting forth the grounds and reasons of their secession; and immediately on reading it retired from the house, followed by the other seceders. The whole was conducted with great solemnity and propriety.

Having withdrawn, the seceders repaired to a hall provided for the purpose, and were reörganized by another prayer offered by Doctor Welsh, as moderator of the last assembly, and commenced their career as an independent body. Their protest was then read again, and is as follows:

Protest.

"We, the undersigned ministers and elders, chosen as commissioners to the general assembly of the church of Scotland, indicted to meet this day, but precluded from holding the said assembly by reason of the circumstances hereinafter set forth, in consequence of which, a free assembly of the church of Scotland, in accordance with the laws and constitution of the said church, cannot at this time be holden; considering that the legislature, by their rejection of the claim of right adopted by the last general assembly of the said church, and their refusal to give redress and protection against the jurisdiction assumed, and the coercion of late repeatedly attempted to be exercised over the courts of the church, in matters spiritual, by the civil courts, have recognized and fixed the conditions of the church establishment as henceforward to subsist in Scotland, to be such as these have been pronounced and declared by the said civil courts, in their several recent decisions in regard to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, whereby it has been inter alia declared —

"1. That the courts of the church, as now established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions, and in particular in their admission to the office of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the pastoral relation, and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations, in opposition to the fundamental principles of the church, and their views of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

"2. That the said civil courts have power to interfere with, and interdict the preaching of the Gospel and administration of

ordinances, as authorized and enjoined by the church courts of the establishment.

"3. That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the church courts of the establishment, against the ministers and probationers of the church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

"4. That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the church courts of the establishment, deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry, and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers; restoring them to the spiritual office and status, of which the church courts had deprived them.

"5. That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judicatories.

"6. That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a church court of the establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a church court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions in opposition to the court itself, and to the superior judicatories of the establishment.

"7. That the said civil courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before courts of the church by law established, and to interdict such courts from proceeding therein.

"8. That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the church courts of the establishment, and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeably to the institution of the office by the head of the church, nor to sit in any of the judicatories of the church, inferior or supreme, and that no additional provision can be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among members of

the church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests; and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline, in any parish, without the coercion of a civil court.

"All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the head of the church hath conferred on the church alone.

"And further, considering that a general assembly, composed in accordance with the laws and fundamental principles of the church, in part of commissioners themselves admitted without the sanction of the civil court, or chosen by presbyteries composed in part of members not having that sanction, cannot be constituted as an assembly of the establishment without disregarding the law, and the legal condition of the same, as now fixed and declared.

'And, further, considering that such commissioners as aforesaid would, as members of an assembly of the establishment, be liable to be interdicted from exercising their functions, and to be subjected to civil coercion at the instance of any individual having interest, who might apply to the civil courts for that purpose.

"And considering, further, that civil coercion has already been, in diverse instances, applied for and used, whereby certain commissioners returned to the assembly this day appointed to have been holden, have been interdicted from claiming their seats, and from sitting and voting therein, and certain presbyteries have been, by interdict, directed against their members, prevented from freely choosing commissioners to the said assembly, whereby the freedom of such assembly, and the liberty of election thereto, has been forcibly obstructed and taken away.

"And, further, considering that, in these circumstances, a free assembly of the church of Scotland, by law established, cannot at this time be holden, and that any assembly in accordance

with the fundamental principles of the church cannot be constituted in connection with the state, without violating the conditions which must now, since the rejection by the legislature of the church's claim of right, be held to be the conditions of the establishment.

"And considering that, while heretofore, as members of church judicatories, ratified by law, and recognized by the constitution of the kingdom, we held ourselves entitled and bound to exercise and maintain the jurisdiction vested in these judicatories with the sanction of the constitution, notwithstanding the decrees as to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical of the civil courts, because we could not see that the state had required submission thereto as a condition of the establishment, but, on the contrary, were satisfied that the state, by the acts of the parliament of Scotland, forever and unalterably secured to this nation by the Treaty of Union, had repudiated any power in the civil courts to pronounce such decrees, we are now constrained to acknowledge it to be the mind and will of the state, as recently declared, that such submission should, and does, form a condition of the establishment, and of the possession of the benefits thereof; and that, as we cannot, without committing what we believe to be sin — in opposition to God's law, in disregard of the honor and authority of Christ's crown, and in violation of our own solemn vows — comply with this condition, we cannot in conscience continue connected with, and retain the benefits of, the establishment to which such condition is attached.

"We, therefore, the ministers and elders aforesaid, on this, the first occasion since the rejection by the legislature of the church's claim of right, when the commissioners chosen from throughout the bounds of the church to the general assembly, appointed to have been this day holden, are convened together, do protest — that the conditions foresaid, while we deem them contrary to, and subversive of, the settlement of church government effected at the revolution, and solemnly guaranteed by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union, are also at variance with

God's word, — in opposition to the doctrines and fundamental principles of the church of Scotland, — inconsistent with the freedom essential to the right constitution of a church of Christ, and incompatible with the government which he, as the head of his church, hath therein appointed, distinct from the civil magistrate.

"And we further protest, that any assembly constituted in submission to the conditions now declared to be law, and under the civil coercion which has been brought to bear on the election of commissioners to the assembly this day appointed to have been holden, and on the commissioners chosen thereto, is not, and shall not be, deemed a free and lawful assembly of the church of Scotland, according to the original and fundamental principles thereof; and that the claim, declaration, and protest of the general assembly, which convened at Edinburgh in May, eighteen hundred and forty-two, as the act of a free and lawful assembly of the said church, shall be holden as setting forth the true constitution of the said church; and that the said claim, along with the laws of the church now subsisting, shall in nowise be affected by whatsoever acts and proceedings of any assembly constituted under the conditions now declared to be the law, and in submission to the coercion now imposed on the establishment.

"And finally, while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God's word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to strive by all lawful means, as opportunity shall in God's good providence be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agreeably to the Scriptures, and in implement of the statutes of the kingdom of Scotland and the obligations of the Treaty of Union, as understood by us and our ancestors, but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the establishment, while we cannot comply with the conditions now to be deemed thereto attached, — we protest, that in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is and shall be lawful for us, and such other commis-

sioners chosen to the assembly appointed to have been this day holden as may concur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for the purpose of taking steps for ourselves and all who adhere to us; maintaining with us the confession of faith and standards of the church of Scotland, as heretofore understood — for separating in an orderly way from the establishment; and thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of His glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house according to His holy word. And we do now withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have now come upon us because of our manifold sins, and the sins of this church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured conviction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this, our enforced separation from an establishment which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the dishonor done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of His sole and supreme authority as king in his church."

The number of ministers uniting in the Free church movement was about four hundred and sixty, of whom two hundred and sixty were pastors, and of course had to relinquish their pastoral charges, and the legal provision for their support. The whole number of settled ministers in Scotland is about nine hundred and forty; and that of all classes, settled and unsettled, is about twelve hundred. So that the Free Church movement embraced more than a third of the whole established ministry, together with most of the students and probationers who had the ministry in view. The ratio of the seceding membership to that which remained was about the same as that of the ministry.

The seceders immediately organized secession churches, and commenced a national independent establishment, under the title of *The Free Church of Scotland.* They were chiefly from

the middling and lower classes, with a few of the minor aristocracy. But they comprehended many clergymen and laymen. of great energy and zeal in the service of God, and acted with promptness and vigor. Some of them adopted the voluntary principle of providing for the support of the ministry, by voluntary subscriptions and contributions from choice, as on the whole the expedient and the best method. But the majority adopted it only from necessity, and cast themselves upon it with regret. It was their only dependence, and all parties were obliged to make the most of it. and do the best with it that they could.

They raised directly £232,347, to be used as a fund to aid in the support of the ministry. This fund was large enough to pay £160 a year to five hundred ministers, and it was subsequently much increased. The independence of the Free church was accidental. They did not abjure all dependence on the state because they were opposed to it in principle, but because the state, in their judgment, exercised its prerogatives to oppress them.

The Free church of Scotland did not organize as a new church, on different principles from the old. It adopted no new principles, but resisted the extension of the prerogatives of the state. It was satisfied to be in connection with the state, and under its authority, if the state would exercise its authority with reason and moderation. But it required the state to have a reasonable regard to the interests of the church; and, being unable to secure that object, withdrew from the church of its dominion.

Previous to the formation of the Free church, in 1835 and 1836, the dissenters from the establishment constituted about one-third of the population. The government assembly after the separation was still more reduced, and restricted to a still smaller proportion of the entire people. It consisted of those who were disposed to adhere to the national establishment, however it might be administered, and were generally willing to second the views of the government in respect to it. In 1842

a law had been passed repealing a previous law of 1797, which prohibited the use of their pulpits to all ministers except their own order. This law was in accordance with reason and propriety. It did not compel the state-church ministers to invite others into their pulpits, but it allowed them to do so if they thought best. But in 1843 the government assembly repealed the more liberal law of 1842, and returned to the exclusiveness of 1797, by prohibiting the occupancy of their pulpits to all ministers out of their connection. — Eclectic Review, vol. xiv., pp. 93—113.

It might be supposed that a large and powerful body, formed as the Free church was, would abandon the excessive conservatism of the national church, and adopt a more progressive policy. But this is not to any considerable extent the case; it is a reproduction of the national church, without its dependence on the government, and without government patronage; but in all essential respects the same as the mother church. Not only are its confession of faith and discipline the same, but its policy in respect to the great political questions of the day is essentially the same. "This body," says a correspondent of the *New York Evangelist* of the present year, writing from Edinburgh, "takes instinctive ground against all improvements. The bill before parliament for abolishing the odious tests for admission to the university was characterized as tending to destroy the just and legitimate influence of the church in the education of the youth."

With much that is noble and excellent in both the great national churches of Scotland, the Established church and Free church, it cannot be doubted that the blight of excessive conservatism is to some extent on them both. In its subjection to the state, the Established church has admitted into its policy an element entirely unknown to the apostolic church, and one that has proved a prolific source of corruption both in ancient and modern times, the element of state supremacy. Such are the tendencies and liabilities to corruption in the best and most

favorable conditions, that, with this great disadvantage, we may calculate with certainty that evil is at the door.

The Free church movement is less a sign of progress in the church, than it is of progress in the state usurpation and oppression, which at length reached a height and extent that were deemed no longer tolerable. Their fathers would have judged the same. The Scotch church does not meet the demands of the times as an instrument of progression. And yet it is doing much for the world by its foreign missions in the propagation of Presbyterian Christianity, by independent churches; and though not perfect, it is one of the best of all the great conservative church organizations, and comes nearest to the transcendently glorious scheme of primitive Christianity.

The Free church of Scotland has entered with spirit on the work of foreign missions, and is one of the most zealous and successful laborers in that field. Its periodical press is also an engine of great moral power, and is wielded with great effect to oppose the arrogant pretensions of high-church Episcopacy on the one hand, and rationalism and infidelity on the other. It does not promise great improvements. It does not aim at them. But, as far as its own system is in advance of Episcopacy, and above rationalism and infidelity, it is both able and willing to battle for the truth with irresistible effect.

CHAPTER XII.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN THE UNITED STATES. — ITS INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL HISTORY.

The Presbyterian church of the United States was formed by Rev. Francis McKemie, of Lagan Presbytery, Ireland. Mr. McKemie came to this country at the solicitation of Colonel Stevens, of Maryland, and formed the first American Presby-

terian church at Rehoboth, in Somerset county, Maryland. Mr. McKemie's arrival in this country was in 1682, sixty-two years after the landing of the Congregationalist pilgrims on Plymouth rock. He came as a missionary of Presbyterianism, to plant that order on these shores; and labored in that vocation from 1682 till his death in 1708, a period of twenty-six years; and left a deep mark on the sands of time.

In the time of the union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, in London and the vicinity, formed in 1689, Mr. McKemie had correspondence with them, and actually visited England and Ireland for the purpose of obtaining aid in evangelizing the American colonies. This is referred to in a letter by the presbytery of Philadelphia, written May, 1709, as follows: "The negotiation begun and encouraged by a fund, in the time that our worthy friend Mr. McKemie (now deceased) was *with you*, for evangelizing these colonies, was a business exceedingly acceptable to a multitude of people." In 1710 the same presbytery writes to the presbytery of Dublin as follows: "Our late reverend brother, Mr. Francis McKemie, prevailed with the ministers of London to undertake the support of two itinerants for the space of two years, and after that time to send two more upon the same condition, allowing the former to settle, which, if accomplished, had proved of more than credible advantage to these parts."

On his return from England he brought with him two laborers of his fellow-countrymen, John Hampton and George McNish, from the same presbytery of Lagan, Ireland, to which he had originally belonged. His return with this reïnforcement was in 1705.

Mr. McKemie is first mentioned on the records of the county court of Accomac, Virginia, in 1690, as then settling in that county. Dr. Miller, in his life of Dr. Rogers, says, that McKemie was sent as a missionary to the American colonies, by the dissenting ministers in and about London, and refers for his authority to some of the oldest ministers then alive, who were

well acquainted with the fact. However that may be, it is evident that he was an Irish Presbyterian, and that he was on terms of intimacy with London Presbyterians, and not with the Scotch.

His liberality is further evident from his friendship for Rev. Jedediah Andrews, who came from New England to Philadelphia in 1698, and founded, as a Congregational church, what is now the First Presbyterian church in Philadelphia.

In 1690 Mr. McKemie was prosecuted by the Episcopalians who were displeased with his evangelical labors, in Accomac, and attempted to be silenced; but, securing the friendship of the governor and others, he was allowed to proceed without further molestation in his work. He preached the Gospel extensively in Maryland and Virginia, and organized several churches. The presbytery of Philadelphia was organized in 1705, and consisted of Rev. Messrs. McKemie, Andrews, Hampton, McNish, John Wilson, Samuel Davis, and Nathaniel Taylor. One half of these were Irish Presbyterians, and the other half Congregationalists. McKemie's preference of Presbyterianism seems to have secured that organization in preference to Congregational organization. In allusion to this organization, Mr. Andrews says, in a letter to a friend in New England, "That they could all submit to the presbytery readily enough, though mostly from New England."

Mr. McKemie at his death left a large property, and, among other bequests, gave his theological library "to Rev. Jedediah Andrews, minister of Philadelphia, and after his decease or removal, to such minister or ministers as shall succeed him in that place and office, and to such only as shall be of the Presbyterian and Independent persuasion, and to none else." He also bequeathed to the same "his black camlet cloak, and his new cane, bought and fixed at Boston."

These bequests mark the character of Mr. McKemie as a liberal Presbyterian, in opposition to those of a more exclusive character; and, as he was the father of the Presbyterianism

then existing in this country, it marks that, in its early stages, as of a liberal character, admitting fraternity with Congregationalism. The same estimate of the Presbyterianism of that period is confirmed by the facts known respecting Rev. Jedediah Andrews and his church. Mr. Andrews was a New England Congregationalist, educated at Harvard University, Cambridge. He organized the first Congregational church in Philadelphia, in 1701. Its original members were English and Welsh dissenters, and French Huguenots or Presbyterians. At its first organization this church was Congregational. It was governed by the minister and committee-men, appointed by the church, without an eldership. Mr. Andrews exercised the pastorate forty-six years, till his death, in 1747. His church retained its Congregational character till 1770, when it adopted the Presbyterian system, by the appointment of an *annual eldership.* This was subsequently exchanged for an eldership holding their office during life.

Rev. J. Andrews appears on the minutes of the presbytery of Philadelphia in 1706, and from that time till his death, in 1746, without a single absence; an example of great punctuality in the discharge of his presbyterial duties.

For many years he was clerk both of presbytery and synod. During the first twenty-five years of its existence, the presbytery of Philadelphia received several clerical members, originally from England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland and New England; but adopted *no confession of faith.*

In 1729, its churches and ministers having become considerably numerous, the presbytery adopted the Westminster confession of faith, catechisms, directory of public worship and discipline. It did not at first adopt them to be subscribed to implicitly, without the least qualification or reserve, but "as being in all the essential and necessary articles good forms of sound words, and systems of Christian doctrine." Besides this, provision is made for the admission of candidates to the ministry, who might take exceptions to some parts of the confession, provided

they were not deemed to relate to things essential and necessary. In process of time, considerable additions having been made to the church, both ministry and laity, from Scotland and other foreign countries, more strict views began to be entertained respecting subscriptions to formularies; and in 1736, nine years after the adoption of the confession of faith, a resolution was adopted, requiring it to be adhered to in every particular.

Diversities of opinion also arose on the subject of revivals of religion, and measures suitable for the promotion of piety. Those who favored Whitfield and the Tennents were called New lights, and the New side; those who opposed them, the Old side. The New lights generally, perhaps universally, favored a liberal construction of the confession of faith; the Old side demanded strict adherence to all church formularies. Hence arose violent debate and frequent collision in ecclesiastical bodies, till it eventuated in the schism of 1741, by which the entire body was divided. The initiative in this schism was taken by the Old side. Finding that they had the majority in the meeting of the synod in 1741, the Old side protested against the New side, as too corrupt to be allowed to sit with them. It was then ascertained that the New side were in the minority, whereupon they withdrew. The fault found with the New side was, that their doctrines and principles of church government were in many points not only diverse from those of their Old side brethren, but directly opposed to them. At the time of this division, the two parties in the church were nearly equal; and the majority of the Old side in the synod of 1741 appears to have been accidental.

The next year, 1742, the New side brethren came back in greater strength, entered into the meeting of the synod, outvoted their Old side brethren, appointed one of their members, Rev. John Dickinson, of New York, moderator, and reclaimed their places in that body. An interlocutory meeting was held, and the subject discussed without leading to any reconciliation. After waiting and laboring two years with their Old side brethren, to

bring them to a perception of their duty, the New side brethren organized the synod of New York, September, 1745. Both synods, with their churches, held on their course as independent bodies, seventeen years, till 1758, when they united together by a virtual concession on the part of the Old side synod. The general assembly was not organized till thirty-one years after this, in 1789. But union in the same church judicatiories did not produce agreement either in respect to doctrines or measures. The same divisions and diversities of sentiment that had existed before the schism of 1741, continued after the reünion of 1758. Some fraternized with Congregationalism; some abhorred it. Some favored a strict interpretation of the confession of faith; some construed it liberally. Some favored revivals of religion; and some opposed the occasions that were called such, as outbreaks of fanaticism and extravagance. The Old side came to be called the Old School party, and the New side the New School party. The two parties were nearly matched in the general assembly. Sometimes one had the majority, and sometimes the other; but in several important decisions at different general assemblies the New School party had prevailed, much to the disquietude and alarm of their Old School brethren. The Old School party had prosecuted Dr. L. Beecher, then of Cincinnati, for heresy. The general assembly acquitted him. They prosecuted Rev. Albert Barnes, and condemned and suspended him from the ministry, in the synod of Philadelphia. The case came before the general assembly by appeal, and the assembly acquitted him. These cases had thoroughly tested the strength of parties, and had shown that the balance of power was on the New School side. The Old School party made great exertions to have their views as strongly represented as possible in the assembly of 1837; and, obtaining a majority, exscinded the four synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee and Western Reserve, and dissolved the third presbytery of Philadelphia, to which Rev. Albert Barnes belonged, all of which contained the strength of the New School party. This

act was revolutionary. It was attempted to be justified on the plea of expediency, to save the church from corruption; and but for this measure the predominance of New School principles would have been inevitable in the entire body.

On the excision of these synods, the greater part of the New School party throughout the entire church also withdrew and made common cause with their exscinded brethren; and the next year, 1838, witnessed the organization of the New School Presbyterian Church, not professedly as a new body, but as a continuation of the old body, on constitutional principles. Such it undoubtedly was.

Since this time there have been two general assemblies, and two general Presbyterian churches; designated properly the Old and New School. The schism of 1741 was temporary. It lasted only seventeen years. That of 1837 is likely not to be permanent, but will continue for an indefinite period.

The excision of the New School portion of the American Presbyterian church was, in the opinion of the Old School body, justified and demanded by the following considerations.

1. That the exscinded brethren favored Congregationalism. 2. That they did not hold *strictly* to the confession of faith, and that some of them gave it a qualified assent. 3. That many of them were unreasonable in their opposition to slavery, and were disposed to put slaveholding under the ban of the church, and make it a disciplinable offence. 4. That they deviated from strict Calvinism. 5. That they were in favor of independent societies, and opposed to church-boards for prosecuting missionary and other benevolent operations.

Dr. L. Beecher, then of Cincinnati, Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, and previously Dr. Duffield, had been prosecuted before the church courts, on the charge of departing from the confession of faith, and attempted in vain to be condemned and silenced as heretics. Others were equally obnoxious to the displeasure of their Old School brethren, as the abettors of the same views. A great point of difference between Old and New School

Presbyterians was that in relation to church-boards for the prosecution of benevolent objects. The plan of carrying on benevolent operations by independent societies had grown up, imperceptibly, in this country, under the patronage of Congregationalists. The Congregational churches generally contributed through them, and left them to use their contributions according to their discretion.

The Presbyterians had fallen into the same system. It was apparently working well, and the majority were not disposed to depart from it. The Old School brethren contended that the prosecution of these objects was the unquestionable duty of the church in its corporate character, and that it could not safely be transferred to independent societies. Accordingly, that church, immediately after the separation, established the following church boards:

1, Foreign missions; 2, Domestic missions; 3, Education of candidates for the ministry; 4, Religious publications.

A similar policy is pursued by other orders, with the exception of the Congregationalists. The reason that it has not appeared practicable for the Congregationalists to adopt this policy, is, that their organization is yet incomplete; and that they have no general church court or advisory council in which all the churches of their order throughout the country are represented. They require this addition to complete their system, and cannot long neglect to make it. When such a council is constituted, it will not only become a board of union and coöperation in other respects, but in this also; and will probably lead to the adoption of the same policy, with respect to church-boards, for that order, which has already been adopted by Old School Presbyterians, and most other church orders.

Some New School brethren have objected to the titles of New and Old School Presbyterians, and prefer to be called Constitutional Presbyterians, &c.; from the fact that their excision was unconstitutional. This would require the brethren of the other assembly to be called Unconstitutional Presbyterians; a desig-

nation which could never obtain. But the convenience of these titles is considerable, and there is no good objection to the popular designation of New School Presbyterians, as applied to one branch of the great Presbyterian family, and Old School to the other. The two schools are thus not inappropriately described by their names.

Since the separation, there has been a reäction in the New School body in favor of Old School principles, and many have made it an object to keep as near to Old School principles and practice as possible. This has been especially the case with respect to Calvinistic theology. Many New School ministers vie with the most strict of the Old School in implicit subjection to that great thinker; and Old School philosophy is of paramount authority in the New School branch of the church.

Taylorism is at a ruinous discount among New School Presbyterians, and is viewed by many with the utmost suspicion and dislike.

The effect of the division has been to increase, for the present, the popularity and ascendency of the Old School principles, at the expense of the New.

New School principles were stronger in the general assembly of both schools, before the division, than they are in the New School at the present time. For all practical purposes New School principles are annihilated, and the entire New School assembly, with its ministers and churches, have gone over to Old School conservatism. The standards of the two churches are precisely the same, and with few exceptions are assented to in both assemblies in the same way. Very few ministers would experience any difficulty in passing from the New School connection to the Old, or would find their associations less congenial by such a change. Their different external relations is the principal difference that appears.

The correlative branches of the American Presbyterian family are numerous and flourishing, but all of them fall considerably

below the Old and New School assemblies, in respect to the number of their churches and communicants.

With the exception of the Cumberland Presbyterians, they all adhere strictly to the confessions of faith which had their origin in Europe, in the early stages of the Protestant reformation, and sympathize with the Old School assembly on the principle of a strict construction of their confessions, and strict Calvinism. Most of them are tenacious of their names, and of the slight peculiarities of their respective orders. The Cumberland Presbyterians, however, considerably exceed the New School in their deviations from Calvin, and are professedly Arminian in theology.

CHAPTER XIII.

OLD AND NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIANISM.

The origin of Old School Presbyterianism has been given in the previous chapter. Immediately after the excision of their New School brethren, in 1837, the excisionists appointed church boards for the prosecution of benevolent objects, and commenced the administration of all church matters according to their own peculiar views of scriptural authority and expediency. Their missions have been prospered, and the missionary spirit considerably promoted among their membership, so that the cause of missions has been a gainer by the change. Their book concern has gone into successful operation, and is a powerful auxiliary of the ministry and membership, both in the promotion of religion generally and in that of their order in particular. The same may be said of the Methodist book concern. It is an instrument of immense church influence, and exerts a mighty power on the nation at large.

In the separation, the Old School body retained the venerable seminary at Princeton, N. J.; which, with its correlative agencies, is a powerful director of public opinion, and has given that body considerable advantages over the New School. The New School took off Auburn and Lane seminaries. But both fall far short of Princeton in authority and influence, as well as in resources. Considerable efforts have been made, in the Old School body, to secure among its members a thorough religious training of the young; and it is believed that, in this respect, that body is in advance of the other. In regard to slavery, the same conservative policy has been pursued as in former years. Slavery is deplored, and generally condemned as a great evil, and sometimes as a great sin. The members are admonished to strive against it, to promote its removal, and mitigate its oppressions, at much as they can; but are tolerated, without rebuke, in slaveholding, if they see fit to practise it. This body is believed to be strictly Calvinistic. Its book of faith and discipline is so, and the church is administered on the principle of a strict adherence to the book.

The Old School body has enjoyed very considerable prosperity, has a large annual growth, and is one of the most respectable and influential bodies in the land. It is probably the best specimen of Westminster assembly Presbyterianism and Calvinism in the world, exceeding even Scotland in realizing the ideal both of the Westminster divines and of Calvin. Its leading ministers are men of eminent learning and piety, and its laymen comprehend some of the most distinguished of the American people. As a body, they are considerably zealous for their church polity, and regard their standards with great veneration. Whatever the system can accomplish, they will be likely to effect. They are thoroughly testing both the system of Calvinistic theology and Presbyterian polity; and seem likely to show, by experiment, what they can do for humanity, where their beneficial operations end, and how they are limited.

This is but a repetition of previous experiments in Scotland,

Holland and Switzerland, and, to some extent, in England and France; but it is a repetition of those experiments in new conditions, and with increased advantages for success. All the world, and the people of all future times, are interested in the result. Whatever that result may be, it will be a practical lesson of great importance. It will be a contribution to the developments of Christianity, and will assist to direct future ages in its further development. Every good man must rejoice to have it do all it can. The more good it can accomplish, the better. Every good man must grieve at its short-comings, and lament its deficiencies and errors. Untold blessings wait on its success, and the untold calamities and miseries of the continued reign of sin wait on its partial failure.

With all the thoroughness of its Calvinism, however, it is not perfect, and no body ever has been. Diversities of opinion have always existed, and always must exist, in respect to some of the deeper and more recondite doctrines of Calvinistic theology. The doctrines of a general atonement, and general sufficient grace for the attainment of salvation, are believed to be common among Old School Presbyterians, as they are among all other evangelical Christians; and these are wide departures from strict Calvinism, and a strict construction of the early Protestant confessions.

It is the common fate of all artificial systems of theology, that once come to be had in great honor, to be abandoned in fact before they are abandoned in name. This is, to a great extent, the case with Calvinism. There are points in his system as there were in the system of Augustine, from which it was copied, that are pushed to an extreme. But the system was argued with great force. It was extensively adopted as the best and highest development of Christian doctrines, and almost essential to salvation. It was received into the principal creeds of Protestant Christendom, not excepting the thirty-nine articles of the church of England; and there it has remained till now. In the mean time, other doctrines have also sprung up, and silently displaced

one Calvinistic element after another, till even in churches professedly Calvinistic the original system of Calvin and his times is very much impaired. This silent influence prevails among Old School Presbyterians, as it does in the rest of the world, nor is it possible or desirable for them to escape its operation.

The New School Presbyterians, at the time of the excision, claimed to be the progressive portion of the general body. Their general aim was progress; while that of the other party was conservatism. They subscribed the confession of faith, as teaching correctly the general system of Protestant orthodoxy and scriptural truth; but they did not all assent to it strictly, without any dissent or violent interpretation whatever. On some things they differed from their brethren, and from the confession. Their differences excited the alarm and distrust of their Old School brethren. The assembly had been largely reïnforced from the sons of New England, and the descendants of the Congregational Puritans. New England had no stereotype theology. Its confessions of faith were Calvinistic, and such was the actual faith of its people; but theology was considered open for discussion, and capable of improvement; and its divines, from the beginning, made it their direct aim to improve the system of theology, by bringing it into a more perfect agreement with the word of God and right reason.

Edwards was not a mere conservative, retailing and defending the opinions of earlier times, but an original propounder of opinions unknown before. The same was true of Hopkins and Emmons; and the same is true of Drs. Taylor and Fitch, of New Haven. Whether these men thought right or not, they thought for themselves, and revised the thoughts of earlier times. They re-judged the judgments of the framers of confessions, and in some cases made additions to them, or deviations from them. New England had tolerated this, and allowed considerable diversities of opinion on many of the more abstruse parts of Christian theology. It accorded well with her principles to do so. Edwards, Hopkins and Emmons, had never been regarded as her-

etics in consequence of their innovations in religious thinking and Christian faith; but were loved as fathers, and honored as guides.

New England had sometimes been restive under this freedom of opinion within the church. Individuals were displeased with it, and regarded it as a portent of future evil; a disposition dangerous to the interests of orthodoxy, to be put under some restraint, and to be indulged with special caution. But few deemed it a proper subject of church censure, and many gloried in it as giving promise of future increased wisdom and knowledge. The New School portion of the Presbyterian church, previous to the excision, were, to a great extent, the disciples of New England theology. They considered it the theology of progress, and in some respects an improvement of the best earlier opinions of Europe. This scheme of doctrines, in its most acceptable form, was embodied in the work of Dr. Dwight on theology. Dwight was not one of the improvers of New England theology, unless to a very limited extent; but he was its ablest expounder. He expounds it fully, as it was held and taught by the ablest and best New England ministers in his time. His work was extremely popular, both in America and Europe, and gave to the New England system a place in the world's regard which it had never possessed before. Dwight's Theology gave New England theology to the world, and made it the property of the human race.

But the New England ministers did not stop here. The disposition to innovate and improve on the judgments of all previous ages was alive and active as ever; and some were as little disposed to accept Dwight as the last dispensation of theology, as their fathers had been to accept the fathers of the Westminster assembly, or the divines of Scotland and Geneva, as of that character.

Emmons did not stop with the landmarks of Dwight, but improved upon him in respect to the theory of regeneration. Taylor advanced still further, and proposed new views of man's free agency and the principles of God's moral government. These

were under discussion in New England, and occasioned warm debate. They were adopted by some in the Presbyterian church, and debate arose there. Men did not differ greatly; but those who thought the new views wrong thought them exceedingly pernicious.

Emmons had made considerable advances on the theology of Dwight. He was an original and powerful thinker, and spent his whole life in thinking on some of the more recondite and metaphysical subjects in theology. He was one of the most acute and logical reasoners that this country, or any country, has ever produced, and one of the boldest and most independent thinkers. It was inevitable that such a man should have some new thoughts, and be an innovator on the established opinions of his time. Such was the fact with respect to Emmons. He proposed several new views in theology, which were extensively discussed in his day. Some of them are generally rejected, some of them are extensively approved. His doctrine of regeneration is believed by many to be a great improvement on the Taste scheme of Dwight and many of the older New England divines, and the Disposition scheme of Princeton and the Old School of Presbyterians. He taught that a change of heart was a change of exercises, from hating God, to loving him; from refusing God, to choosing him; from hating the good and true, to loving the good and true; from refusing the good and true, to choosing and pursuing the good and true: that it consisted in a change of exercises exclusively, not in a change of tastes or dispositions, as the starting-point and origin of all other changes; but in a change of exercises in the loving and hating faculty, the choosing and refusing faculty, as the starting-point and source of all possible changes of tastes, dispositions and other habits.

Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, succeeded to Emmons, as a leader of progressive thinking in New England on the subject of theology, sifted his opinions, adopted those which were generally approved, and proceeded to originate others. His innovations have had relation principally to the system of moral

government, and the nature, powers and rights, of moral agency. He first called in question the doctrine that sin is a necessary evil, and a good on the whole, and denounced it as a gross corruption of Christianity, and an absurdity, and a doctrine of extremely immoral tendency. He also asserted strongly, with most divines of the church of England, and with all divines of the non-Calvinistic denominations, the full ability of the sinner to repent and avail himself of God's mercy, through Jesus Christ.

These doctrines were under general discussion in New England, and excited much attention in the Presbyterian church. They were believed to be extensively adopted by New School Presbyterians, and gave occasion to earnest debate. The New School advocated them as truths of great practical importance; the Old School opposed them as pernicious errors, tending to overthrow the whole system of Calvinistic orthodoxy. Just at this time, prosecutions were instituted against Dr. Beecher, then of Cincinnati, and Mr. Barnes, of Philadelphia, not as holding singular opinions, but as prominent men in the Presbyterian church holding new opinions, and those in agreement with the progressive theology in New England, with a view to silence them, and depose them from the Presbyterian ministry. Those men were no more obnoxious than others, not as much so as some others; but their high standing and character gave importance to their views, and made their trial a virtual trial of the system of religious doctrines which they taught. Both these trials were ultimately unsuccessful. Mr. Barnes was suspended for a time, and submitted to the decision till it could be reconsidered in the general assembly. On its reconsideration there, it was reversed, and he returned to his pulpit. Dr. Beecher could not be condemned or censured. After almost infinite labor and expense, it was found impossible to arrest the new opinions by the authority of the church courts. The strength of the parties was thoroughly tested, and the balance of power found to be with the New School.

The principles of New England were in the ascendency. This

thoroughly alarmed the Old School party, and led to the excision of the four synods, as related in the previous chapter. This happened not in the ordinary course of affairs, but was brought about by great and special exertions. The excision was immediately objected to as unconstitutional, and measures were unfortunately taken to secure legal redress. These failed, and the New School body, which at first drew off from the other with the design of compelling a reünion, reluctantly settled down in a separate and independent organic condition. It is very questionable whether the policy of the New School brethren, in withdrawing and setting up an independent establishment for themselves, was wise. They have lost much by it, and gained little. The expectations on which this measure was adopted have not been answered. The whole movement has resulted in a great Old School victory, and in the virtual abandonment, by the New School body, of some of their principles.

The New School body made a trial, at first, of some change in the system of polity, but soon resorted to that of the Old School. The New School adhesion to the Westminster confession of faith is a little less strict than that of the Old. The deviations from it are generally very slight, and the great majority of New School ministers adhere to it as strictly as the Old School.

The policy of the New School church, with respect to its general church charities, is yet the same as at first; but a large number of its members hold to the expediency of church-boards, in preference to independent societies; and things are apparently tending to a speedy adoption of that Old School measure.

A denominational book concern is already commenced; and denominational missions are engaging attention, under the title of church extension. Though not authorized by the book, a portion of the New School church are in favor of representative elderships holding their office for a term of years, and some few churches are making trial of this method. But, as a body, the New School church have decided against this as a corruption of the Presbyterian system. The New

School theological seminaries are languishing at present, but no reason appears why they should not ultimately flourish. They are not sufficiently original to command great respect as New School institutions.

The policy of New School Presbyterianism with respect to slavery is, essentially, the same as that of the Old School body. It discusses the subject more, and publishes a little stronger resolutions against it, but does just as little. Both alike tolerate it in their communions, and thus give it their support. They denounce it as generally sinful, and profess to be greatly opposed to it. Some of them really are. But they do not effectually prohibit it to their members by making it a disciplinable offence; and probably they will not, under any ordinary pressure of arguments or events. The Old School body, however, is most in the confidence of the South, is most acceptable to slaveholders, and has a large majority of the Southern churches. Of the two bodies, the Old School is the largest and strongest; and, in consequence of the greater completeness of its arrangements, is advancing with the greatest rapidity in the number of its communicants and churches. The Old School is, to some extent, the model of the New, and it is the aim of several of the leading spirits of the New School connection to copy that model as closely as possible. This is a disadvantage to the order, and threatens to hinder its prosperity. A copyist must always follow at a distance, and travel at a disadvantage. It is easier to be a good original than it is to be a good imitation, and originality presents superior claims to respect and consideration.

The New School labor under another disadvantage. One portion of the body is held to it by a very slight affinity; and it is constantly in danger of withdrawing and uniting with the Old School. Another portion is held to it, on the other side, by an affinity equally slight, and is continually in danger of being drawn off to the Congregationalists. Between these two antagonists, the prospects of New School Presbyterianism, as an organization, are not very bright.

This is especially true of it in its present character of thorough church conservatism, on the subject of slavery, and the confession of faith.

The Presbyterian experiment in this country is a part of our great national experiment. From small beginnings it has grown to be a large and powerful family of churches, and exerts great influence in giving direction to public sentiment on all the great questions of piety and morality. These churches have generally been favorable to republicanism in the state, and have usually taken the side of Christian piety and morality on all the great political questions of the day.

Both schools, and most of the other Presbyterian bodies, have enlisted zealously in the temperance reformation, and have labored indefatigably to help it along. Against the system of slavery they have not been silent, and in regard to it they have not been indifferent. Their testimonies and remonstrances against it have often been loud and earnest. But they have not prohibited it to their membership. This is their great error.

The other great national churches of America have pursued the same policy, of tolerating slaveholding in their communions, and many of them have remonstrated less against it than the Presbyterians. This is especially true of the Roman Catholics and Episcopalians. These great church establishments have numerous slaveholders in their connections, and allow them to remain there, unquestioned in respect to slaveholding. Neither have they come out to testify against slavery in any way that is generally understood.

The Quakers long ago took action on the subject, and interdicted slaveholding to their members, and for many years their order has been entirely free from this sin. Many among the New School Presbyterians are in favor of the same policy, and have for years been advocating it in the general assembly; but without effect. The great mass of the church, as represented in the general assembly, is against it. The southern clergy and eldership are, almost to a man, against it. A considerable sec-

tion has broken off on this account, and formed a new anti-slavery connection. Similar secessions took place among the Methodists, previous to the triumph of anti-slavery principles in the Methodist church north.

The toleration of slavery by the state is no direct matter of the church. The church is independent of the state, and is required to respect the laws of God and the rights of man, whether the state respects them or not.

If slaveholding is right, the church ought to interpose no obstacle to its being practised by its members. But if slavery is wrong, if it is a great wrong, if it is one of the greatest wrongs that has ever been perpetrated and upheld, the church ought to command its members to abstain from all participation in it, as they do from other wrongs; and, if they disobey, to treat them as offenders. The church forbids gambling, whether the state tolerates it or not. It should equally forbid slaveholding. Already is there a strong sentiment against slavery at the south, though it does not appear, in national church judicatories. Among twelve hundred church-members in Kentucky, in the New School connection, only seventy-five are slaveholders. This is one in sixteen. Only three New School ministers in Kentucky hold slaves, and these acknowledge the evil and undesirable character of the institution. When African slavery was first introduced, directly after the discovery of this continent, it was a great question of the day, what action the church should take with respect to it. Should the church legalize it, by permitting her members to hold slaves? or, should she prohibit it to her members, and, as far as her authority and influence extended, have prohibited it to the Christian world? The day had been when a bishop in the Roman communion dared to debar the first potentate of the world from the Lord's table, because his hands were stained with the blood of the innocent. Should the church now lift up her powerful voice, and marshal the full extent of her authority against the enslaving of the African? or, should she wink at it, and let it pass as only a tolerable evil?

Unfortunately, the institution arose under the Spanish and Portuguese dominions, in the twilight of expiring Christianity. To doubt the supremacy of the Pope, was heresy enough to put in requisition inquisitorial torments, and consign the innocent victim to consuming fires. But to doubt the sacred rights of humanity, and to crucify the Lord afresh in the persons of his colored disciples and redeemed subjects, was comparatively a small matter.

Yet even in Spain this enormity did not come in unresisted. Cardinal Ximenes, one of the most illustrious prelates of his time, made vigorous resistance to it, and many in all classes, shocked at its inhumanity, pronounced against it the wrath of God, and implored the church and state to prohibit and anathematize it. Even the so-called successors of St. Peter, from their spiritual thrones, in several cases gave their voices against it, and interdicted it to the church and kingdom of their care. But the insatiable thirst for gold was too strong even for the Papal arm long to hold out against it. Slavery came in more and more, in spite of remonstrance and imprecation; and has continued down to our time, the curse and shame of our age and country.

It is peculiarly an American institution. It originated mainly on this continent, and has made this continent the principal scene of its conquests and prevalence, the field of its glory and shame. After a prevalence of three hundred years, the question of its lawfulness is again opened for discussion and determination, and the church of God is called upon to decide whether slaveholding may be allowed to its membership, or whether it must be forbidden. For its allowance, is pleaded the precedent of the church for three hundred years; also the precedent of the apostolic churches in allowing the slavery of those times. Against it, is pleaded its great injustice, the manifold evils to which it leads, its opposition to the fundamental maxims and laws of Christianity, and the dictates of humanity and natural reason; its injurious effects on the whole, with respect to all parties, the oppressor and the oppressed; and the burning shame

which it brings down on Christianity and the Christian civilization to which it belongs.

After much discussion and debate, the two great schools of Presbyterianism have taken ground, strongly and unequivocally, on the conservative principle of allowing slaveholding among their membership. Nor is there any essential difference between them, in this respect. This is one of their common principles, taken deliberately, and designed to be carried out with vigor, and persisted in forever. They hope that slavery may tumble down sometime, and be overthrown. They would rejoice in its overthrow, but they do not feel authorized to prohibit it to the membership of their churches. They have the power to do it, if they had the will. They have the will to do it, if they thought that such a measure would meet the approbation of the great Head of the church, and be for the best. But they do not so understand the will of God, and the exigencies of his cause and kingdom. They do not understand slavery to be an evil of such magnitude that it ought, in all possible ways, to be discountenanced and opposed; and yet they think it, on the whole, very wrong; both a great sin and a great calamity. Some think that the holders of slaves ought to be bought off from their slaveholding, and that the whole nation ought to enter into a scheme of purchasing up all the slaves at the market price, and sending them to Africa. This scheme of purchase pretends to have some admiration for self-sacrificing generosity, and despises the littleness of those selfish bigots, that wish to reclaim men from profitable sins, or induce them to leave off sin at a pecuniary sacrifice. No! say they, let the reformer put his shoulder to the wheel; let him bear the pecuniary expense of the reformation, and make good the losses it may occasion. It is replied that the *little* that a righteous man hath is better than the riches of many wicked; that godliness is profitable in *all things*, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come; and that no man can lose property in the service of God, and the performance of duty, without ordinarily in the end being a great gainer

in this life, besides obtaining in the next world life everlasting. All these are Scripture principles, but they go for nothing on the subject of the supposed ruin to be encountered by giving up the assumed rights of the slaveholder, and conceding to human beings the ownership of themselves. This must be done at a sacrifice, and the man that makes that concession must be rewarded for his sacrifices in so doing at the expense of the reformer who calls him to repentance, and instructs him in his duty.

The consent of the church to African slavery for the space of three hundred years, and, while disciplining numbers for stealing five dollars, or even five cents, or for retaining and using stolen property, refusing to discipline for holding men in the condition of beasts and things, as chattels-personal, under the absolute control of the possessor, will be noted in future times as one of the wonders and mysteries of human ignorance and inconsistency. But so it is. In the current orthodoxy of Romanism, a man may be a slaveholder, and hold his fellow-men in the condition of beasts and things, under the absolute power of a property possession, to use them for his interest and pleasure, regardless of their interests and pleasures, and be a good Christian. As such he is admitted to the church, allowed the benefit of its sacraments, advanced to hold church offices, and his name inscribed on the church records as one that denies himself; that follows his Divine Master through evil report and through good report; that sells all he has, if need be, to give to the poor; that loves his neighbor as himself, and esteems others better than himself; and that seeks, above all things, the glory of God and the good of his creatures, in all his doings.

This is the way the Catholics treat slaveholding. How do the Protestants treat it? The Episcopalians, Methodists south, and Old and New School Presbyterians, all treat it in the same way, precisely. They allow it in their communions. They will not prohibit it to their membership. The Presbyterians have at different times reported against slavery, and exhorted their members to desist from it as far as convenient; but they have never interdicted it, and cannot be induced to interdict it.

Such a measure is deemed, in their bodies, highly extravagant and improper, highly *oppressive* and injurious, as well as contrary to order and the constitution of the church.

The consequence is, that slavery thrives among us, under our republican constitution; amid all our devotion to our own liberties, and the independence of the nation, and in the face of our solemn declarations that God has created men with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which no man and no potentate may invade with impunity. Till the church abolishes slavery under her jurisdiction, we need not expect the state to abolish it under its jurisdiction. If it is really wrong, let the church prohibit it to her membership; if it is right, let both the church and state strive together to redeem it from reproach, to invest it with the glory and honor of rectitude and love of the good and true, and to make it universal and perpetual.

The church has had its trial questions in all ages; questions that have put it to the proof, that have tried its spirit and principles, and that have in their results demonstrated its purity or corruption. In the first ages the question of conniving at idolatry was of this kind. Christians would not worship idols, they would not give countenance to idol-worship, in any form or degree. In later times, it was the question of worshipping the mass, and submitting to the supremacy of the Pope; and now, it is the question of liberty, or African slavery. Different characters meet this question differently. The Papal, Episcopal, Methodist south, and Presbyterian churches, meet it with toleration, a reluctant toleration; a toleration accompanied with occasional remonstrances, and denunciations of the thing tolerated, as not altogether right. The Quakers, and many Congregational churches, meet it with reprobation and prohibition, as equally a crime against God and man; and as a crime to be prohibited, peremptorily and universally; and not only so, but as a great crime, tending to immense evil, and the more to be resisted and suppressed on account of the magnitude of its evil.

CHAPTER XIV.

CRITICAL POSITION OF NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIANISM.

It has been a serious question with New School Presbyterians, whether their order should be made permanent in its present form, or be gradually changed to be of a somewhat different type. It is now a very slight variation of Old School Presbyterianism, so slight as not to be ordinarily observable, except to a very discriminating mind. The majority of members in both churches do not perceive the difference, and require considerable teaching perfectly to apprehend it. In respect to a majority of ministers and members, there is no difference. They might, for aught that they know, or that anybody can demonstrate, be on one side or the other, with equal consistency. But, taken all in all, there is some difference. The entire New School, as a whole, adheres to the confession a little less closely than the other body. It is a little less reverential of the authority of creeds and confessions, a little more given to change. The Old School body, as such, is a little more active in promoting the thorough Christian training of the young; insists a little more on infant baptism, and is a little more denominational in its feelings and policy. Formerly, New School men were deemed the most interested in revivals of religion, and the most interested and engaged in the use of means to promote them. But, if there ever was a difference in this respect, that has passed away. It hardly seems possible that the New School should always exist as a separate, independent body, with so little deviation from the Old School. It might well consent to sustain church-boards for the sake of reünion with its Old School brethren, even against its judgment of expediency on the

whole, if that measure was judged of alone. The sacrifice would be slight. And a majority of all its ministers and members would almost immediately prefer that arrangement to any other. Indeed, it is doubtful now whether a full discussion of the subject, in any New School assembly, would not leave a majority favorable to the plan of church-boards. What, then, is to hinder a reunion? No great principles of religious belief; no great diversities in policy or order. The two bodies, as a whole, are more alike than the well-united parts of many other religious bodies; nor would there be anything to quarrel about if the two bodies were together; not even Dr. Beecher and Mr. Barnes. These fathers might be liable to a little criticism, but they would obtain general forbearance.

What is there to keep these bodies forever apart? They might unite next year. The Old School might say: "Brethren, we distrusted some of you, and cut you off. We thought you were unsound in the faith. But we are convinced to the contrary If you were unsound, or verging towards unsoundness, our discipline has had the effect to reclaim you. Come back again. Our doors are open to you, our hearts are enlarged. It was an evil day when we thrust you forth. But you are of us still. Come into our churches, come into our pulpits, and inherit with us the whole land." If such a call was made, what is to hinder its being immediately accepted? How many hearts would respond instantly: "Lo, glad we come. We have both had our faults, we have both committed our errors. If you have been suspicious of evil when none was intended, and in some cases been disposed to restrict and curb our liberties, we have been impatient and resentful. If God can forgive us, we can easily forgive you. And we do forgive you, and beg your forgiveness. We were not altogether in the right; you were not altogether in the wrong. We will forget and mutually forgive, and be one again." Then where is the New School church? Absorbed and lost; but not missed. It fills no such mighty void but that it can be spared. No great interest of humanity

would suffer, no great movement in favor of the kingdom of God and the well-being of man would be arrested.

Already has the New School church disappointed both friends and foes. Regarded for a long time as the party of progress in the Presbyterian family, and by some as the revolutionary party, all the world expected that, on coming out and taking its independent position in the family of churches, it would accomplish something worthy of its pretensions. But what has it done? What great act has it performed? What are its heroic achievements in the cause of God and man? It has done nothing original; nothing that its great exemplar, the Old School, has not done or might not have done. The mountains have been in travail, and an ordinary birth only has occurred, not to speak of more diminutive results.

At the present moment, New School Presbyterianism is an empty name, or, to a great extent, a duplicate of the system of the Old School. The two are not distinguished, or distinguishable. Other denominations can be distinguished, and are distinguishable. The Old School Presbyterians contend for organizations according to the Westminster confessions and book of discipline; the Baptists, for immersion, and adult baptism only; the Congregationalists, for church democracy; the Episcopalians, for episcopal government. But what do the New School Presbyterians contend for, peculiarly, in distinction from all others? Nothing. A small fraction of them contend for new views in theology, which are not found in the confession of faith. A portion of them contend for interdicting slavery to the membership, and disciplining it. But the great mass contend only for the confession of faith, and adhere strictly to all the principles of Old School Presbyterianism.

It does not seem possible that this order should long retain its separate independent position on the platform of its elder neighbors, without going over to them and joining them, or else shooting ahead of them, and putting a little more distance between themselves and the church from which they have seceded. In

respect to church-boards, it appears destined to follow its Old School brethren at no distant day. Nay, it is on the road after them already. And it ought to be there. Because in this respect they are ahead, and on the track of duty and sound policy.

It was supposed that the New School would adopt a different policy from the Old on the subject of slavery, and interdict slaveholding to its membership. But it will not. That matter is sufficiently settled, and may be allowed to rest. A struggle of sixteen years, under the most favorable circumstances, that has accomplished nothing, had better be given up. And if it is not, sixteen years more will accomplish just as little. That is not the field in which to do battle against slavery. A skilful commander not only fights, but chooses his field of conflict with a sound discretion. He will not fight everywhere and anywhere. nor allow himself to be attacked everywhere and anywhere. He chooses his field of confiict where he can fight to advantage. Otherwise he labors in vain, and spends his strength for naught. So in the great moral conflicts of the age; the friends of great principles must choose their fields of conflict, if they would hope to prevail; and the field where nothing can be gained had better be deserted. Had the New School church interdicted slavery to its members as a great sin, not to be tolerated; had it placed the holding and dealing in stolen and oppressed men and women on the same ground that it places dealing in stolen horses or other property, and disciplined for it as a sin, not only to be remonstrated with, but to be prohibited; not to be prohibited merely, but already prohibited by the law of Christ, and on no account to be indulged by his people, then it would have had one original, peculiar point of difference to distinguish it from the Old School. Right or wrong, it would have been something tangible and intelligible.

Had it adopted the system of representative elderships, by electing its elderships in all cases, or at the option of particular churches, for a term of three or four years, and restricted all judicial business to the presbyteries, it would have essentially

modified its system, and increased the power and influence of the membership in the regulation of church matters. It would have become an intermediate system between pure Presbyterianism and pure church democracy. There would have been this in its favor, that it would have had an intelligible and permanent character of its own.

Had it revised its confession of faith, it might have set up a claim to superiority on the ground of an improved standard of faith. But it has done none of these things, and will not do any of them. There is a party of reformation, or there are parties of reformation, that would attempt improvements in all these respects, but they are perfectly powerless and harmless. The conservative element is so predominant, that no considerable change can be effected. Nor is this strange. The system is not constructed to be easily changed. It was designed, at the beginning, to last forever, and to last without change.

The consequence of all this is, that New School Presbyterianism has begun to lose members on both sides. On one side it loses extreme conservatives, to the still more conservative Old School body; and on the other, it loses progressives, to bodies that are more popular and more progressive. And this process is likely to go on with increased rapidity on the side of progressives, as fast as they get their eyes opened to see that their church is really not a church of progress, but of conservatism. Besides, there is a large Congregational element in the membership, and one of some magnitude in the ministry, that requires but a slight occasion, at any time, to repel it from Presbyterianism to Congregationalism, the system of its preference.

There is a party in the New School church which has expected better things, and some of them still cling to that expectation. Being moderate progressives themselves, they wish to believe that their church is so, and that the progressive element can be so stimulated and increased as to secure gradual and steady progress. But time and experience is fast dispelling this illusion. Sixteen years have passed, and where are we now? Have we

advanced a step? Have we established a character of originality and improvement in any point? Not a step of progress can be shown; not a point of improvement in the way of departure from Old School precedent. All our change has been to greater conformity to that body. We are more conservative, more orderly, more orthodox, more in subjection to the confession, and pervaded with a higher and deeper reverence for that instrument; and many of our ministers and members are complaining because we are not more conservative still. Nor is this all. Members that propose progress, or urge discussion in that direction, in any of our judicatories, are subject to continual reprimand as troublers of Israel.

At the time of the New School organization, it was thought that there was a sufficient element of progressiveness, among Presbyterians, to form a denomination of this character; and many went into the experiment with this expectation, in the hope, not of following Old School Presbyterianism at a respectful distance, taking particular care never to get out of sight of its precedents, but of building up a new order on better principles. Of all this, not a thing has been done; and, at the present time, not a thing is likely to be done. The two Presbyterianisms are sailing after the same chart precisely, and in the same direction; and everything is arranged so much alike, that when seen together, without any artificial badges of distinction, one cannot ordinarily be distinguished from the other; and this is not by the Old School becoming New, but by the New School becoming Old.

DIVISION VI.

THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

CONGREGATIONALISM AND ITS OFFICERS.

Congregationalism is another name for church democracy. It derives its name from the government of the church, on democratic principles, by the congregation. The Congregationalists were originally called Brownists, from the name of their founder, and, subsequently, Independents. The name of Independents was given with reference to the doctrine of the independence of single churches, and the rejection of all superior supervision and control. Congregationalism is opposed to the Papacy, the government of the church by a Pope; to the Episcopacy, the government of churches by bishops; and to Presbyterianism, the government of churches by sessions or boards of elders chosen for life. Congregationalism acknowledges no spiritual court above the church, and no superior authority but that of Christ. It is, therefore, the uncompromising enemy of all hierarchical and aristarchical church despotisms whatever, and denounces them all, as unscriptural and inexpedient, and as leading to indefinite corruption and unlimited abuse.

It admits the pastoral associations of ministers for mutual advice and counsel, but not as church courts of legislation and spiritual jurisdiction. It admits mutual and exparte councils to advise the church, but not to rule it. The same may be said of conferences, conventions and synods. None of these bodies have

authority to bind the churches. Each separate church has the powers of supreme sovereignty, and does not usually deem itself allowed to part with them on any pretence, or to any body whatever.

The nature of Congregationalism is not fully described by the title of Independency, or Congregationalism. Its most appropriate title is Democracy, or *Congregational church democracy.*

The Congregational church democracies recognize Christ alone as their head, and admit but two orders of church officers under him; ministers and deacons. Besides, they have licentiates who are candidates for the ministry on trial.

Ministers.

The ministers are called, also, elders and bishops, and are the highest class of officers in the visible church. They read and expound the Scriptures, preach the Gospel, administer the sacraments, preside in meetings for religious worship and church meetings for business, form associations with other ministers for mutual advice and counsel, unite with delegates from the churches in mutual and exparte councils, ordain ministers, &c. They claim to be the proper successors of the apostles, and to possess all the permanent functions of the apostolic office in the church. Ministers are of two classes, pastors and stated supplies.

Pastors.

Pastors are settled ministers established over churches for life, but subject to removal, for good and sufficient reasons, at the request of their churches, and entitled to a dismission from their charges at their own request, on similar grounds. The pastoral office is deemed of great importance, and is of Scriptural authority. The title of pastor is another name for shepherd, and represents the Christian minister as the shepherd of his flock, intrusted with its general care and guardianship. It is his duty to call church meetings, at his discretion, and, at the request of the brethren, to preside in them, to conduct public

worship, preach the Gospel, expound and defend the Scriptures and the doctrines of Christianity, and inculcate universal holiness. It is also his duty to apply the principles of the Gospel to the correction of all existing evils, in the organization and administration of society; and to promote, to the utmost extent in his power, every branch of piety and true virtue. Especially ought he to instruct the young, and to use every means in his power to establish them early in the principles and practice of religion. The *great duty* of the pastorate is the preaching of the Gospel. The proper performance of this duty requires unwearied attention and constant study, both of the Scriptures, the principal religious works that are engaging public attention, and of the characters, conditions, wants and necessities, of his people.

The Congregational pastor holds, in some respects, the highest and noblest office in Christendom. He is the visible head of one of the integral branches of Christ's kingdom; and represents his divine Lord both as prophet, priest, and king. But he may not lord it over God's heritage. He is a leader more than a governor; a teacher and instructor, more than a master. The Congregational pastorate differs from all others in this, that it is supreme. All others are subordinate. The Papal and Episcopal pastors are subject to their bishops, and can do nothing without their permission, or against them. Presbyterian pastors are subject to their presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, and can do nothing against them. But the Congregational pastor is subject only to Christ. He, literally, calls no man master, neither is he rightfully called master; because his office is not an office of despotism, but a ministration of democracy and of liberty.

The influence of the pastor in Congregational churches corresponds to the dignity of his office. Accustomed to regard him as the visible head of their community, the church and congregation naturally, in the course of years, come to honor him with their almost boundless confidence and affection. He is the father and adviser of his people. He bears their trials with them,

and rejoices with parental tenderness and affection in all their joys. The more elderly among them are his fathers and brethren, the younger his children and pupils.

The Pope on his throne, clothed in scarlet, and waited upon by cringing menials, is far exceeded in true dignity by the Congregational pastor. The king, amid his court, is not so glorious, nor so much beloved. He may not be rich. He may not wear the garlands of poesy, or the insignia of the fine arts; but, if he is a good man and true, and has fully appreciated the dignity and beneficent ends of his office; if he has preached the Gospel to the poor, instructed with patience the ignorant, supported the weak and wavering, reclaimed the wandering, and recovered the lost and driven away; if he has taken the lambs in his arms, and carried them in his bosom, and led the faltering steps of the young to Christ, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, he will in many cases set up for himself a throne in the hearts of his people, and reign there, with surpassing glory. This is not an ideal character. The history of Congregationalism gives us many and many such. It is not an obsolete character. Every Congregational community furnishes examples of it, nor is there anything to hinder its becoming still more general than heretofore.

Congregationalism is far outdone by several other denominations in the artificial dignities which they confer on a portion of their clergy. It has no spiritual lords or clerical princes, exalted in rank and power vastly above the rest, supported by princely revenues in the pomp and splendor of kings and nobles. Its ministers are all brethren in external decorations, and the pomp and pride of life, little exalted above their Lord and his first disciples; but in every manly and noble principle, and in all that adds true glory and dignity to the race, they are called to stand forth as patterns to their flocks, and leaders to the world. Nor is there any earthly position better adapted to develop and strengthen the noble and magnanimous in human nature than that of a Congregational pastor in an earnest, devoted, pious,

and faithful church. There is everything in the pastor's position, in such a church, to strengthen and promote in his character the development of all the just and noble impulses and aspirations of humanity.

Pastors are called to their offices by the election of the people, in which the church and the religious society, consisting of all the regular supporters of the Gospel, vote separately, the church in one body, and the society in another. If, on trial, the vote is unanimous, or nearly so, a call is made out; if there is a large opposition, the candidate is generally abandoned, and some other one taken up, on whom the parties interested can agree. When an appointment is made, the pastor elect unites with the church in calling a mutual council for his ordination and installation, if he is not yet ordained; and for his installation, if he has been previously ordained. And he is settled by the council, acting as an ecclesiastical court, by the authority of the church. The ordaining council acts in behalf of the church, and by its authority alone. It is as much a church court as the supreme court in any state is a state court, and as the supreme court of the United States is a national court. When called to act with respect to ordaining and installing a minister, a council has power to act with respect to that matter; and when called and empowered by the same authority to act with respect to other matters falling within the jurisdiction of the church, it has powers requisite for that other action, whatever it may be.

In their character of pastors, permanently established over their churches, Congregational ministers have a greater influence than belongs to the pastorate under any other system of church polity. They are the supreme visible heads of the churches, independent of each other, and of all the world, and responsible to their churches alone, under the laws of Christ. On these laws they stand, and they stand subject to be arraigned at the tribunals of their respective churches, if in anything they depart from these laws, or are supposed to depart from them. As long as they adhere faithfully and clearly to the laws of Christ, no human power can ordinarily disturb them in the exercise of their

office. If they depart from these laws, they are instantly subject to impeachment before a mutual council, if they concur with their church in calling one; and an exparte council, called by the church, if they do not concur in calling a mutual council. Before such a council they are liable to be condemned for all their moral and ecclesiastical wrongs.

Other things being equal, the Congregational pastor exerts an influence which is powerful in proportion to his piety, wisdom, and virtue. If these are eminent, his influence becomes great; if he is wanting in respect to any one of these, his influence is proportionably diminished and restricted.

Though holding an office of great power and authority, the Congregational pastor is not too far above his people to be reached by discipline, if he betrays his trust. The church calls him by its own election, and that of the congregation; it settles him by a mutual council; and if he fails in the discharge of his duty, proves incompetent, or immoral, or heretical, and unfit to exercise the high office to which he had been called, the church takes measures, with his consent, by a mutual council, or without his consent, by an exparte council, to try him, and, if there is occasion, to depose or otherwise remove him from his pastoral office. The authority of an exparte council, in a case where the pastor refuses to concur in calling a mutual one, is just as valid as that of a mutual one in case such a council had been consented to. A church is not obliged to ask the consent of the minister to call a court for his trial. When it can obtain it, however, it chooses to do so; because it wishes to give him every reasonable advantage for the fairest possible trial. But when the minister does not concur, the church exercises its just prerogative, to appoint its exparte court and proceed to his trial, just as it would to that of any other accused person.

Ministers who are not settled, but who preach occasionally, or statedly to the same church, are called occasional and stated supplies. Stated supplies are generally engaged for the year;

and often serve many years in succession in the same church. The method of pastoral settlements is believed to be much the best for all parties, and indispensable to their highest dignity and usefulness.

It must also be admitted, that while the pastoral office under Congregationalism is, in favorable circumstances, an office of great dignity and usefulness, contributing to the respectability and happiness both of the pastor and people, it is also liable to peculiar trials and difficulties. Many churches are small and feeble, and afford their pastors but a slender support. Churches are liable to divisions on a variety of religious and moral questions; and among the less cultivated these divisions beget animosities, and provoke unkindness, evil speaking, and evil doing. Pastoral settlements, which in theory are permanent for life, and adapted to bind the parties together in loving and faithful bands, never to be sundered till Jesus calls us home, often pass away almost with the year which produces them, and leave bitterness and sorrow behind.

These evils are not confined to Congregationalism. They prevail to an equal extent among Presbyterians. But they are great evils, and never have been greater than during the last half-century, and in this country. They have grown up, incidentally, with the decline of genuine and thorough piety in many churches, and the rise of formalism on the one hand, extravagance and fanaticism on the other. They are greatest and most troublesome in feeble churches, where, with the most hearty coöperation of all the members, the pastor is supported with difficulty; and where the slightest and most limited dissatisfaction and coldness on the part of the people makes his support impracticable.

There are two methods of contributing to the correction of these evils. One is, by elevating the standard of genuine piety and virtue, in the churches and among the ministry; and the other is, by increasing the independence of the ministry. The mendicant orders have done very good service to Popery; and

the most extreme poverty does not necessarily disqualify a minister of Christ for the performance of the highest ministerial duties and services to the church and world; but there is a demand, under Congregationalism, for a more independent and better-supported ministry; and if that support cannot be obtained from the voluntary contributions of the churches and societies, the ministry must provide it from other quarters.

A minister that is at the mercy of the most contemptible faction in his society, for bread to supply the demands of his family, and for the permanence and stability of his pastoral relations, is in circumstances to be exposed to inevitable trials. His known dependence provokes and emboldens a factious spirit; and wicked men will be numerous and mean enough to make him feel the full extent of the evils to which he is liable. Two of the great elements of prosperity to religion are, first, a free, untrammelled ministry, and, secondly, an *independent* and resolute one.

It is desirable that pastors should be able to devote themselves exclusively to the spiritual care of their flocks; but it is infinitely more desirable that they should make provision for the comfortable and honorable support of their families, by devoting some part of their attention and industry to that object, than that they should place themselves at the mercy of unreasonable and wicked men, by living on the verge of pauperism.

Paul sometimes received an insufficient support in his work of evangelizing the heathen; but his own hands supplied the deficiency of the people's justice and benevolence. So it was with the Congregational fathers of New England. Many of them ministered to flocks unable to give them a competent support; but their own industry completed the provision, and in many cases raised them to an easy competence.

Latterly, ministerial industry in secular pursuits has been much discouraged, and has greatly declined; and one of the disastrous consequences of this decline has been, that a large class of ministers are inadequately supported, and not a few of

them reduced to distress. Another consequence has been the disgraceful and ruinous frequency of pastoral changes, making the whole doctrine of permanent settlements in the Congregational and Presbyterian orders an object of general contempt. Another effect still is, that many are repelled from seeking the ministry on account of the great uncertainty of obtaining an adequate and stable support in it for the pastoral office.

The correction of these evils is partly in the hands of the membership, and partly in that of the ministry. If the membership want a faithful and able ministry, they must see it well supported. That is not a good support which falls short of an easy competence. If they cannot or will not secure this to their minister, they must be willing that he should seek it for himself, as Paul did, by engaging in secular employments for the purpose, and must encourage and support him in doing so. And ministers must not allow themselves to incur unnecessarily the reproach of not providing properly for their families and themselves. They must resort to secular employments, as far as need be, to supply the deficiencies of their ministerial support. They may do this in the country by having small farms, and in the cities by other methods. It will be objected to this that it tends to secularize the ministry. That may be; but necessity is the supreme law. The ministry must have a stable and honorable support; and must, as a general rule, be placed in a condition of easy competence, in order to fulfil its task, and accomplish its divinely-appointed mission.

There are many examples of ministers acting on this plan, both at the West and East, at the present time; and most of these have operated beneficially to all parties concerned. The well-sustained minister, though sustained in part by his own secular labors, is ordinarily a better and more successful minister, than the most gifted starveling of the ministerial profession, that devotes himself exclusively to his profession on an inadequate support. Besides, he saves himself many unprofitable mortifications, and the cause of religion much reproach.

Besides, the most independent and aggressive of all church orders wants an independent and fearless ministry; a ministry that can afford to be unpopular, that can charge home on the world and on the church, if need be, its mighty sins, and beard the lion of impiety and wickedness in his dens. Such a ministry must be well supported, independently of the grudging charities of formalists and hypocrites. If it depend on these, they will fail it in the time of need, like those deceitful brooks described in Job. The troops of Tema looked; the companies of Sheba waited for them. They were confounded because of their hope. They came thither; and were put to shame. — Job 6: 19, 20. So false and deceitful are the confidences of a dependent ministry in battling with the sins of a wicked world. Pledged charities fail, and stipulated salaries are withheld for the very purpose of crippling the minister's efforts, and palsying his arm. If he is not subservient, he must be starved to submission.

This is no exaggerated picture, drawn from imagination. The victims are numerous who are suffering at this moment, not only the evils here described, but more than language can express; and the great principles of religious democracy are more obstructed, in their progress through the world, by the wholesale degradation of democratic church ministries, than by any other one cause. This degradation is not universal; but unfortunately it is not uncommon, and it must be corrected. The entire pastorship of Congregationalism must be placed on a more independent footing with respect to support. A church of freedom and independence cannot be served by a ministry of slaves or of mere hirelings, put upon the smallest possible allowance that will suffice to keep flesh and bones in working order.

The doctrine of serving God at a sacrifice, and following Christ at the expense of the loss of all things, if need be, is a beautiful doctrine and true. The man that will not follow Christ at the expense of losing all things has no just conception of him, or of the benefits and glories of his service, and is

most unfit to be intrusted with the ministry of holiness. But sacrifices to God do not justify sacrifices to the devil; and the just and honorable character of the loss of all things in meeting the great emergencies of the church and world, do not justify us in tamely submitting to be robbed and crushed for no good whatever.

Deacons.

The deaconship in the Congregational church approximates to the dignity and importance of the eldership in Presbyterianism. Deacons, like pastors, are chosen for life, and ordained by the pastors, ordinarily without the imposition of hands. This is a deviation from apostolic example, Acts 6: 6. The first seven deacons of the church of Jerusalem were ordained with the imposition of hands. This departure from apostolic example, with respect to the manner of ordaining deacons, is not in consistency with the general principles of Congregationalism, which regard the primitive arrangements of the church as perfect in all respects, and not to be improved upon; and it grows out of another change, in respect to the nature of this office. The Congregational deacons have charge of the charities of the church designed for the poor, receive and distribute them, take up contributions for this purpose and for the supply of the Lord's table, have the charge of the table, and distribute the elements. Besides these services, they may perform any others proper for laymen, under the direction of the pastor or otherwise, by which they may promote the welfare of the church.

This leaves a greater distance between the deacons and pastors than existed in the primitive church. It has been shown, pp. 68—80, that the primitive deacons were assistant ministers, participating with their principals in the higher duties of religious instruction, as well as in the care of tables and of the poor. The Congregationalists might revive this office, without departing from any essential principle of their system. Assistant minis-

ters and sub-ministers have been found very useful among the Methodists, where, under the title of local preachers, they have performed a great amount of preaching, and other evangelical labors. Congregational deacons might be authorized to act as assistant preachers, under the direction of their pastors, and at the request of churches, greatly to the advantage of the cause of religion.

Licentiates.

Besides its regular and permanent ministry of pastors and deacons, Congregationalism admits a class of sub-ministers, denominated Licentiates. Licentiates, in the Congregational churches, are like the same class in the Presbyterian, and correspond equally to the deacons in the Episcopal church, and among the Catholics. They are candidates for the ministry, admitted to preach for the limited period of two or four years, or for an unlimited period, on trial. If their trial proves satisfactory, they are advanced to the ministry. If it proves unsatisfactory, on the expiration of their license they fall back into the ranks of the laity. The authority to give licenses belongs properly to the churches, where all other ecclesiastical power belongs; and the Baptist denomination restricts it to those bodies. But among Congregationalists, so called, it is generally exercised by associations of ministers, with the tacit consent of the churches.

CHAPTER II.

CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH COURTS.

1. *Church Meetings.*

It is a fundamental doctrine of Congregationalism, that the church is not subject to any superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction above itself. The church is supreme. Other churches and other bodies may advise it, asked or unasked; but no other body can command it, and none ought to be allowed to command it. Congregationalism discards the idea of a universal church, formed either on the principle of representation or despotism, to command particular churches. This has been the general doctrine of the Congregational fathers of New England, and it is affirmed by the Congregational union of England and Wales, in 1833, as follows: "The New Testament authorizes every Christian church to stand independent and irresponsible to all authority, except that only of the supreme head of the church, the Lord Jesus Christ." Dr. Stiles, of Yale College, speaks the general sentiment of New England on this subject, when he says: "Our churches acknowledge no jurisdiction of sister churches over them. The moment jurisdiction enters, like creating Cæsar perpetual dictator, the loss of liberty commences. The exigences of the churches can never be such as to legitimate, much less render it wise to erect any body of men into a standing judicatory over them."

Congregationalism, therefore, reverses the methods adopted by all other orders, and makes the church, in its collective capacity, supreme, and the court of all the male members of mature age its supreme court, both of legislation and judicature.

The church is organized by individuals assenting to a confession of the Christian faith, and entering into a covenant to be

governed by certain rules, supposed to be in agreement with the principles and objects of Christianity. It may be organized by a minister holding authority to preach, administert he sacraments, and perform other ministerial duties, from some previously organized church or church court; or, it may organize itself independently, with no foreign aid, and no foreign counsel. Becoming organized, with a constitution and government, a church is an ecclesiastical body, competent to appoint and inaugurate all its officers, and to do all things which a church may lawfully do. It may choose its ministers and ordain them; and, for good and sufficient reasons, it may entertain charges against its ministers and other members, for heresy or immorality, and may bring them to trial on such charges, before such courts as it may choose to institute for the purpose. It may condemn the guilty, and depose and excommunicate them.

Private members are generally disciplined before courts of the membership, and assembled church meetings; ministers, by mutual and exparte councils.

It is the duty of Congregational churches to maintain a cordial fellowship with each other, and, in all ordinary cases, to respect each other's judgments. They may not ordinarily justify those whom a sister church condemns, or condemn those whom a sister church justifies. But, if a church is satisfied, on good grounds, that any sister church, or any number of sister churches, have acted with prejudice, and have judged erroneously, injuriously and wickedly, it is not bound to respect those judgments, but to protest against them. It would contradict the first principles of Congregationalism to bring in a law binding churches, in all cases, to pay a blind, unquestioning deference to the judgment of other churches. This would be introducing, in another form, the very despotism against which the whole history of modern Congregationalism is an earnest protest.

Congregational churches are independent of each other, but not above each other; and, though independent of each other, they are not independent of God. They can make no law against

God's law, and cannot give validity to any judgment contrary to truth and reason. The law of God binds all these churches, and is the sole common law of all. Any law against this is null and void, *ab initio*, with no binding force whatever, and entitled to no respect. Of this every individual is sole ultimate judge for himself, as an individual, and must exercise his judgment under the infinite responsibilities of the divinely-appointed system of moral agency; and every church is sole ultimate judge of its duty as a church. God's judgments do not require re-judging; but all human judgments do. We are not only allowed, without incurring any just charge of arrogance, to re-judge all human judgments, both of individuals and associated bodies; but we are bound to re-judge them, according to our abilities and means of information, and must do it in order to be safe, and in order that the world may be safe.

Churches, therefore, may and must, in many cases, re-judge the judgments of sister churches, and depart from them. And this, so far from introducing general distrust and disorder, as the abettors of despotism would have us believe, is the highest possible principle of mutual confidence and general order.

Strictly speaking, Congregational churches are not subject to discipline. If they do wrong, they may be remonstrated with, and admonished by sister churches; and, if the wrong is of such an aggravated character as to prove a bar to communion, sister churches may withdraw from their communion, and have no fellowship with them.

Congregational church meetings usually consist of the male members of adult age, with the pastor as moderator, *ex-officio*. In the absence of the pastor, one of the members is appointed moderator. In all cases it is requisite that there should be a scribe or secretary, and that a full record should be kept of all the doings of the meeting.

Churches adopt their own constitutions, laws, covenants and confessions of faith, and alter or amend them at pleasure, and have the supreme control of all their affairs.

2. *Ecclesiastical Councils.*

Councils are of two kinds, mutual and exparte. A council that is called by a church, concurring with another party interested in its decisions, is called a mutual council. In these cases each party elects one half of the council, and both parties subscribe the letter-missive by which it is called. An exparte council is called by any aggrieved party to consider and decide in respect to some real or supposed wrong. Councils are called by letters-missive, stating the subject to be considered, or the business to be done. They are courts of churches, and the churches invited are requested to attend by their ministers and delegates. Mutual councils derive their powers from the church and the concurring party calling them; and exparte councils derive their authority from the single party calling them, and the general usage of the churches.

The members of a council, when assembled, organize, for the transaction of business, by appointing a moderator and clerk; both of whom perform the duties usually assigned to such officers in other deliberative bodies. Councils ordain pastors and evangelists, constitute pastoral relations and dissolve them, organize churches, and advise in regard to difficult cases of discipline, both with respect to the ministry and membership. The entire discipline of ministers is usually assigned to mutual or exparte councils. In order that its acts may be valid, a majority of the churches invited to an ecclesiastical council must attend. A minority, however, become a valid council, by the consent of the parties inviting them.

If the action of a council, in the trial of a minister, is not satisfactory, an appeal may be taken to another council of the same kind, to consist in part or wholly of different churches; and the decision of the second council is generally considered as final. If churches are supposed to have become corrupt in doctrine, or irregular in practice, persons aggrieved may expostulate with them and admonish them. And, if this is without effect, the

matter may be submitted, by the consent of the parties, to a mutual council; or, at the request of the aggrieved party, to an exparte council.

If an accused party refuses to appear before a council and answer to charges preferred, the council may examine the case, and advise the withdrawment of fellowship, if they consider it demanded. The acceptance or non-acceptance of such advice, and of all other decisions, rests with the churches.

There is a general agreement among Congregationalists to allow to members who are the subjects of church censures the right of appeal to a mutual council; and the decision of such a council becomes final, by the mutual agreement of the parties to make it so; otherwise, it is optional with the church to accept or reject it. Members under censure are expected to give notice to the church of their intention to appeal from their decision within one month from the time that the action appealed from was had; and his appeal is required to be prosecuted within six months. No advocate is admitted before a council or church who is not himself a minister or member of the Congregational church.

If, in any legitimate question for the advice of a mutual council, the party to which the proposal is made refuses to concur, the other party may call an exparte council for the consideration of the same.

The powers of councils are, in all cases, limited to the purposes of their appointment, and must also be in conformity to the genius and principles of Congregationalism.

The authority of councils is entirely moral. They have no power to enforce their decisions on the churches, and ought to have none. They perform such action as the churches put into their power, and then leave it with the churches. They are not courts above the churches, like presbyteries and synods among the Presbyterians, and the superior courts of other denominations. They are courts of the churches, and under them; every church having in its own power the ultimate decision of every

question, however it may be acted upon by its council, except when questions are submitted, by the mutual agreement of the interested parties, to the final arbitrament of the council. In all such cases the council becomes an arbitration court of the church, for the settlement of its difficulties.

CHAPTER III.

ASSOCIATIONS OF MINISTERS.

Pastoral associations are societies consisting of the pastors and other ministers, of a certain district, which meet regularly, at stated times, for mutual advice and improvement. These bodies were first held in 1690, became general in Massachusetts in 1705, and were extended, about the same time, to other colonies.

They are not church courts, but clerical societies for mutual advice and improvement. They were at first viewed with suspicion by the fathers of New England Congregationalism, from the apprehension that they might gradually make encroachments on the prerogatives of the churches, and become a kind of superior ecclesiastical courts for the administration of church government. This danger was deemed the more imminent on account of the existence of such courts in all other orders of professed Christians. But the associational system was gradually extended till it has become almost universal, and the liberties of the churches have been generally maintained. The only ecclesiastical functions which they have assumed is that of licensing candidates for the ministry. This properly belongs to the churches, and is still retained by them among the Baptists. It has been assumed by the associations among Congregationalists silently.

and as silently acquiesced in by the churches. No particular injury seems to arise from this arrangement, and it has some conveniences. If any church, however, should be dissatisfied, and should choose to exercise its prerogative in this respect, it has the right and power to do so.

Other systems have since been proposed, and, to some extent, introduced, subversive of some of the principles of Congregationalism; but the associational system has generally restricted itself to such limits as leaves the liberty and independence of the churches unimpaired.

Associations are of two kinds, district associations and general associations.

District Associations.

District associations consist of the pastors of a limited district, united together as an independent society, under a written constitution, defining the objects and prescribing the rules of the body. They meet semi-annually, report the condition of their churches, consider questions of doctrine and discipline, license candidates for the ministry, and appoint delegates to the general association; but have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

General Associations.

General associations consist of delegates from the district associations of a state, and are, like the district associations, governed by written conditions, or rules of association, defining their objects and powers, and, as far as may be, their modes of procedure. The general association of Massachusetts admits, as articles of faith, the doctrines of Christianity as they are generally expressed in the shorter catechism of the Westminster assembly, understood to be distinctly those, which, from the beginning, have been embraced by the churches of New England. It is founded on the principles of Congregationalism, and wholly disclaims ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the churches, or the opinions of individuals. Its object is to promote brotherly har-

mony and intercourse among the ministers of Christ; to obtain information respecting the state of their churches, and of the Christian church in this country and throughout the world; and to coöperate with one another, and with other ecclesiastical bodies, in advancing the cause of truth and holiness.

Each district association in the state, consenting to the principles above set forth, may appoint two delegates, annually, to compose the general association; and it is recommended that one of these two delegates should be the same as in the preceding year. Seven members are requisite to form a quorum. The secretary and the minister of the church where the association meets are members by constitutional arrangement, leaving their associations the right to a full representation besides. The several district associations have the right of receiving, in rotation, the meetings of the general association.

The constitutions and objects of other state associations are similar.

To complete the system of associations, it would be necessary to add a *national association*, to be composed of delegates from the general state associations; but this does not seem to be required. The state associations answer all the general purposes of a still higher body of this kind.

CHAPTER IV.

CONGREGATIONAL SYNODS AND CONVENTIONS.

The Cambridge platform of 1648 was adopted by a general synod of the New England churches at that time. Its sixteenth chapter is devoted to the subject of synods, which it describes as spiritual and ecclesiastical assemblies, for the consideration of spiritual and ecclesiastical causes, to argue, debate and deter-

mine matters of religion according to the word of God, for the conviction of errors and heresies, and the establishment of truth and peace in the churches. The power of convening synods was vested in the magistrates, where the magistrate was favorably disposed; but otherwise resided in the membership, and could be exercised by them independently of the civil magistrate. It was the province of synods to debate and determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, to testify against maladministration and corruption in doctrine or manners, and direct in the reformation of the same; but not to inflict church censures in the way of discipline, and not to perform any act of church authority or jurisdiction whatever.

The synods' directions and determinations were to be received as far as consonant with the word of God, but no further; devolving upon churches the ultimate right of judging them. From the impracticability of convening the entire churches of the country at one time and place, to act in regard to church matters, it was deemed expedient that synods should be representative bodies, which the churches should attend by their ministers and delegates.

Of this description was the synod of Cambridge, which adopted the original platform of New England Congregationalism, in 1648. Of the same description was the synod of Boston, which adopted the Savoy confession of faith, in 1680; and the Connecticut synod, at Saybrook, in 1708, which adopted the Saybrook platform, and recommended consociation. All these synods were called by the authority of the state, and were composed of ministers and delegates from the churches. They were superior church courts, appointed by the concurring authority of the church and state, to consider and act on some of the great questions of those times. But, having considered and acted, their action went down to the churches, to be approved or disapproved by each church, according as it was judged to be in conformity with the word of God, or opposed to it.

The doings of these synods were never adopted in New Eng-

land as unerring standards either of faith or church practice. They were received with discrimination; each church most freely accepting what it judged expedient and consistent with the word of God, and rejecting the rest. Still, these platforms and confessions of faith answered a valuable purpose, as expressions of the general belief, and as general tests of orthodoxy. Like the standards of other denominations, they have sometimes been abused by being allowed the honors and authority due to the word of God alone; but, as monuments of the faith of past times, and records of the judgment of pious and good men, respecting the various matters to which they relate, they possess a permanent and superior value.

The Consociational system originated in Connecticut, in 1708, and was based on the Saybrook platform of that year. It had been previously proposed in Massachusetts, and rejected, as inconsistent with the independence of single churches, and therefore on no account to be admitted. The object of consociation was the promotion of greater order and harmony among ministers and churches, the regular introduction of candidates into the ministry, and the establishment of general courts of appeal from the decisions of the churches. They were deemed highly important as courts of judicature, and some of the friends of this system thought that a still higher representative court of the kind might be added to advantage, after the example of Presbyterianism.

The system, from the commencement, met with determined opposition from the staunch Congregationalists of the time. Davenport recommended consociations as *advisory* councils. Burton says: "We hold communion or consociation of churches for counsel in doubts, and comfort in distress, but *deny* any combination of churches by which the liberty of any particular church is taken away." President Stiles, Increase Mather, Governor Wolcott, and many others, denounced the consociational system, as a departure from genuine Congregationalism, and a large and dangerous stride towards Popery and absolutism.

The Saybrook platform allowed the churches to consociate for mutual assistance on all ecclesiastical occasions, and ordained as follows:

1. That the particular pastors and churches within the respective counties in this government shall be one consociation, or more, if they shall judge meet.

2. That all cases of scandal shall be brought to the consociation, consisting of the ministers and delegates of the churches, for determination.

3. That the determination of the consociation shall be final, and that they shall see it executed.

4. That the churches shall withdraw from the refractory and disobedient, and have no communion with them.

5. That the associated pastors shall take notice of any among themselves that may be accused of scandal or heresy; and, if they find occasion, shall direct the calling of the consociation, when such offenders shall be proceeded against.

The same body recommended as expedient the general association of Connecticut, to consist of delegates from all the district associations.

The above general statements are abridged from the Saybrook platform. This system has been in operation in Connecticut from the time of its first adoption, in 1708, till now. It has also been introduced into Rhode Island, and to a limited extent in New York. But it has not met with general favor. It is the virtual creation of district representative churches, over the particular churches; and commits all the great questions of faith and discipline in particular churches to general church courts, but partially dependent on each several church. This accords with the principles of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, but it is a manifest departure from Congregationalism. If the churches require permanent courts, each one may erect its own, and commit to it ecclesiastical jurisdiction, on the principle of perfect representation and dependence. Such a court is not necessary, and consociation is not; but the system of dependent representa-

tive courts, in each church, avoids the objection of a departure from the fundamental principles of Congregationalism.

A portion of the Congregationalists of New England have adopted the system of conferences. The conference system is most fully adopted in Maine. In Maine, the system of conferences corresponds to that of associations in the other states. The Maine conferences are of two kinds; the district conferences, consisting of ministers and delegates from the churches within a limited district, and the general conference, consisting of clerical and lay delegates from the district conferences, in a certain ratio. The conferences are organized with written constitutions, describing their objects and rules of procedure, on the principle of a representation of the churches by delegation, and without any assumption of ecclesiastical authority. The district conferences meet semi-annually, and the general conference annually. The objects of the general conference in Maine are nearly the same as those of the general associations in the other states; and their principal difference is, that the associations are meetings of ministers only, and the conferences of ministers and delegates from the membership. Maine retains the system of district associations, coördinate with that of conferences.

Conventions are independent bodies, composed of ministers and delegates from the churches of a certain district or state; or, as in the case of the Albany Congregational convention of 1852, of the United States. District conventions are called by district associations; and state conventions by state associations. The National Congregational convention at Albany, in 1852, was called by the New York state association, and carried into effect by the concurrence of other state and district associations, approving of the object, and appointing delegates. The object of conventions is to consider and report to the churches respecting questions of doctrine or policy that may be deemed important and of general interest.

The system of Congregationalism is not complete without some arrangement for a general conference of ministers and churches

throughout the nation. The organization of a national conference of all the Congregational churches in the United States, to be composed of clerical and lay delegates from the churches in all the states, and to meet regularly once in a term of four years, might be the occasion of much good. It would be a strong bond of union and agreement between ministers and churches in different states and remote parts of the land; and might constitute a general agency of the whole Congregational church, to conduct all the general benevolent operations of the entire body.

It is questionable whether a conference system might not supersede the associational and consociational systems, and come, in time, to be the general plan for the organization and confederation of Congregational churches, both in this country and throughout the world. Let, for example, the independence of single churches remain the same as now, and all discipline, both of members and ministers, be in their hands, to be administered by the general church court, and by church councils elected by the authority of the churches. But let the churches and ministers form district, general and national conferences: the district conferences to consist of the ministers and one delegate from the churches of a given district; the general conferences to consist of clerical and lay delegates, in equal ratios, from the district conferences; and the national conference to consist of clerical and lay delegates, in equal ratios, from the general conferences. Then let all the duties of associations be devolved on the conferences, and pastoral associations abandoned. Such an arrangement would give us a system of the joint association of ministers and delegates, to deliberate and act in regard to all church matters, but without any legislative or judicial authority over the churches. These conferences would answer all the essential purposes of associations, and would render them unnecessary. They would also act beneficially on the membership, and give them a part with the clergy in the discussion of all the great religious questions of the day.

The Congregational churches of the nation want a visible sym-

bol of their union and agreement, and the general adoption of the conference system would afford them one. Besides, the conferences might easily serve as organs of the churches for conducting their great benevolent operations; the district conferences being the organs of the benevolent operations of the districts; the general or state conferences the organs of the benevolent operations of the states; and the national conference the organ of the benevolent operations of the nation. Such an agency is enjoyed by Old School Presbyterians in their superior church courts, by Episcopalians in their conventions, and by the Methodists in their conferences. Such an organization has hitherto been a desideratum among Congregationalists, and for want of it the great independent societies have arisen to prosecute benevolent objects in behalf of the church.

We have no fault to find with these societies. They found a deficiency, and have labored to meet and supply it as well as they could. But, had the organization of the church been complete, there would never have been occasion for help of this kind. It belongs to the church to enlarge her empire, and extend her beneficence through the entire world. Preaching the Gospel to every creature is her work; disseminating Christian knowledge, by means of the press, is her work; and she ought to take these works in hand, and establish and control directly adequate agencies for their performance.

Every denomination of Christians ought to be a great church extension and moral improvement society; and, in order to be this, churches must have local and general organizations, through which they can act. The Old School Presbyterians accomplish this by church-boards appointed by their general assembly. Such boards are demanded by the New School assembly to give completeness to their organization; and Congregationalism will be incomplete till it receives an organization of this kind.

CHAPTER V.

THE ORIGIN OF CONGREGATIONALISM, AND ITS HISTORY IN ENGLAND.

Congregationalism had its origin in England in 1581, in the the reign of Elizabeth, just forty years after the proposal and establishment of Presbyterianism at Geneva by Calvin, and twenty-one years after its adoption and establishment by law as the national religion of Scotland.

It was first proposed and experimented upon by Robert Brown, who studied at Cambridge, and was admitted to holy orders in the church of England. But he no sooner entered upon the ministry in that church, than he began to denounce its government and liturgy as antichristian. He first succeeded in converting a congregation of Dutch Presbyterians to his views, and introduced his polity among them at Norwich, in 1581, when he was brought before the ecclesiastical commissioners as a disturber of the public peace, and sent to prison. He soon, however, obtained his release, and went with his congregation to Middleburg, in Zealand, one of the provinces of the Netherlands.

In 1585 he returned to England, and resumed his efforts there in behalf of his new church polity; in consequence of which, he was excommunicated by the bishop of Peterborough. After this, he submitted to the church of England, and received a living in Northamptonshire, of which he had the emoluments without discharging its duties. After a life of frequent collisions with the government, he finally died in Northampton jail, in 1630, where he was confined for offences against the magistrates, particularly for contumacy.

His scheme of church polity, however, did not die with him; neither did it lose its hold on the affections and interests of others, on being deserted by its author. The conception of it

seems to have been new. It had been lost for ages in the church, and was covered up deep under the rubbish of more than a thousand years, when Robert Brown had the distinguished honor of exhuming it, and proposing it anew to the world.

He did not propose it as an original conception, but a discovery in regard to primitive Christianity; a feature of the church under Christ and the apostles, lost amid the ignorance and apostasies of subsequent times. It met with violent opposition in the church and state, as all improvements have; and was denounced by good conservatives as subversive of all order and happiness in both. The character of Brown is drawn by his enemies in the darkest colors, with pencils dipped in gall. At this distance, it is impossible to determine his real character. If his enemies are to be believed, he was one of the worst and vilest of men; factious, petulant, disorderly, unstable, unprincipled and ambitious. But it is not safe to take an estimate of any man's character from his enemies, without making large deductions for the blinding influence of prejudice and passion. There are men that can do justice to an enemy, and that would scorn to do him intentional injustice; but unfortunately they have always been few, and boundless depreciation is one of the common arts of malignity.

The Congregationalists of the time of Brown were called, after the founder of their order, Brownists. And such was the activity and success of this order after the death of Brown, that stringent laws were found necessary by parliament to suppress their organizations, and restrain the diffusion of their principles. Their progress was impeded by these means; but their principles continued to become more and more widely diffused, and to gain increasing favor.

The Brownists did not originally admit a professional ministry, deriving its support from the people, but allowed public teaching and preaching to be performed voluntarily by the brethren at their discretion, as has since been done by the Quakers. But this policy was soon abandoned, and a professional ministry

introduced. The name of Brownists was also abandoned, and that of Independents adopted, as descriptive of one of the great principles of their polity, the independence of single churches. The system of the independency of single churches, each having complete and inalienable powers of spiritual sovereignty, was regarded as the greatest innovation made by this order on the usages of the times, and was considered the most remarkable and distinctive feature of their system.

Subsequently, the democracy of this system attracted more attention; its general court, consisting of the entire brotherhood assembled in church-meetings for the transaction of business, and this court having supreme jurisdiction in all matters of doctrine and discipline in respect to the membership, and the name of Independency having acquired associations unfavorable to the progress of the order, the church was called the Congregational church, and its system of polity Congregationalism. This name is likely to be permanent, and is probably the most appropriate that could be assumed, unless that of church democracy should be preferred. The most suitable name of this polity is that of church democracy, and there would be some advantages in adopting it.

The second father of Congregationalism was John Robinson, also an Englishman, and, like Robert Brown, a graduate of Cambridge. He for some time held a benefice in the church of England; but, embracing the doctrines of the Independents, he relinquished his benefice, and, in 1602, at the age of twenty-seven, became the pastor of a Brownist church in the north of England. This was in the last year but one of the reign of Elizabeth. James VI. followed. There were three great parties in the nation. 1. The party of the established church, the great conservative party; 2, The party of the Roman Catholics, the retrogressive party; 3, The party of the Puritans, the progressive party.

Conservatism was in the ascendant; but each of the other parties was sufficiently strong to be formidable. The Puritans

were much the stronger of the two which were not in the ascendency; but still *they* were under persecution and restraint. The advanced column of the Puritans were the *Independents*. They demanded the largest liberty both in the church and state. In many cases they demanded democracy in the church, and republicanism in the state, as the forms of government most favorable to liberty, and most conducive to the public good, and the only system under which liberty can be secure.

The Presbyterians were more moderate. With a limited ministerialism in the church, they wanted only a limited monarchy in the state, and had no objections to the institution of monarchy. The Independents were subject to great annoyance from the civil authorities. They were watched with the greatest jealousy, and their operations restricted as much as possible.

In 1608, in consequence of persecution, Mr. Robinson went with his church to Holland, and located first at Amsterdam, and then at Leyden. At the latter place, he held a public disputation with Episcopias, an eminent Presbyterian minister and professor of theology in the university at Leyden, in 1613, in which he advocated the scriptural authority and expediency of Independency. It does not appear that this debate resulted in any considerable change of opinion on this subject either way. The cause of Independency, however, held its own, and was, on the whole, progressive.

The earliest confession of faith of the Independents that has been preserved was composed by Mr. Robinson, and published in 1619. It is in Latin, and is called "Apologia pro exulibus Anglis, Brownistae vulgo appellantur," — an apology for the English exiles commonly called Brownists.

The second was printed in London during the ascendency of the Presbyterians, in the time of Cromwell, 1658. It is entitled "A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational churches in England (more than one hundred in number), agreed upon and consented to by their elders and

messengers (ministers and delegates) in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658."

In the Westminster Assembly the Independents demanded free toleration of all Protestant Dissenters, and their members had great influence in parliament and with the nation. They withdrew from the Westminster Assembly in 1646, and protested against the action of that body, as intolerant, unscriptural and inexpedient. Presbyterianism was established by law, but Congregationalism was not prohibited.

The Presbyterians were generally conservatives and royalists; the Independents were revolutionists and republicans. This led, naturally, in the course of the civil war with the king, to a predominance of Congregationalists in the army. Being desirous of revolutionizing the country, they enlisted against the king the more readily.

The civil war was commenced in August, 1642, the initiatory being made by the king, Charles I. It was terminated in 1645, when the king met with a final overthrow at Naseby, and being unable longer to keep the field against his subjects, threw himself upon the protection of the Scotch. In 1647, he was surrendered to the parliamentary leaders. By this time, the ascendency of the Independents in the army gave them the ascendency in the nation; and Oliver Cromwell, the head of the Independent military party, was the virtual head of the nation. The king insisted on Episcopacy, and parliament on Presbyterianism; and the two were endeavoring to agree on a single national church establishment, to the exclusion of all dissent.

Under these circumstances, Cromwell forcibly excluded from parliament about two hundred members of the Presbyterian party who were supposed to be favorable to royalty and to an exclusive Presbyterian state church establishment, seized the king, and brought him to trial for making war on his subjects, and otherwise violating the constitution of his country and the principles of its government, and caused him to be condemned

and beheaded in 1649. Europe was struck with amazement at the boldness of this measure.

The government was now administered, for a time, in the name of what is known as the Rump Parliament, but all real power was in the hands of Cromwell and the army. Charles II. was immediately proclaimed king of England, in Scotland, on the death of his father, and attempted, by the aid of the Scotch, to recover his kingdom; but, suffering severe defeats before the armies of Cromwell, he was obliged, in 1651, to take refuge in France. The victorious Cromwell now dissolved the Long Parliament, and governed the country by his own authority, under the title of Lord Protector, till his death, in 1658.

The restoration of the monarchy, and the establishment of Charles II. in his patrimonial inheritance, as king of England, were now brought about by the influence of the Presbyterians, uniting with the Episcopalians against the Independents. The king directly reëstablished Episcopacy, and prohibited, under severe penalties, all dissent. Presbyterianism and Congregationalism were both cast down to the ground, trodden under foot, and loaded with every possible indignity and reproach, and Episcopacy and royalty glorified together. Large emigrations took place to New England, and other parts of the British colonies; and, while Independency was nearly crushed and almost extirpated at home, it was very much strengthened abroad.

Even then God was leading and nurturing his *church in the wilderness*, and overruling the wrath of its enemies, so as to make them ministering angels to the interests of his future kingdom. Without the intolerance and persecution of the English sovereigns, Congregationalism would never have been driven to these shores in sufficient strength to be prepared to meet the great political emergency of the American revolution.

The relations of Presbyterianism and Independency in England, during the period of the civil war and the ascendency of Cromwell, are remarkable. But for Independency, Presbyterianism

would have subverted the religious liberties of England, in favor of an exclusive Presbyterian national church establishment. But for Presbyterianism, Independency would have succeeded in obtaining permanent toleration for herself, and for other Protestant denominations. The distress that followed the reëstablishment of monarchy and Episcopal intolerance was great and long-continued. But all human evils have a limit. So had English intolerance and persecution.

On the accession of William III., prince of Orange, in 1688, dissent was again tolerated, and Presbyterianism and Independency immediately revived.

In 1689 a plan of union was adopted by the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers, under the following title:

"Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational." This agreement consisted of nine articles, and resulted in a kind of fusion of the two orders into one complex order, that was neither pure Presbyterianism nor pure Congregationalism. The ministers and elders, where churches had elders, exercised discipline with the consent of the brethren. Churches might have elders or not, as they thought proper; and might give their assents to the doctrinal part of the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, to the Westminster confession of the Presbyterians, or to the Savoy confession of the Congregationalists. After continuing for a time, this union was abandoned, and the two denominations reörganized separately.

At the accession of William and Mary, in 1688, the celebrated toleration act was immediately passed, exempting dissenters from persecution on account of their religion. In connection with this, William convened a general assembly of the church of England divines, to take into consideration those things in the constitution of the church that were offensive to dissenters, in hope of having some of them changed. But no alteration was allowed. The bishops and dignitaries went for perfect conservatism. If any change at all was made, they saw no place to stop

till the whole was changed. They, therefore, resisted any change.

All modification of the church of England being found impracticable, the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and others, revived their old independent organizations, and commenced many new ones. At the passage of the act of uniformity, in 1660, the Presbyterians were the majority, and far exceeded the Congregationalists in number and wealth.

At the passage of the act of toleration, in 1688, and on their subsequent reörganization, the Congregationalists were the majority, considerably outnumbering the Presbyterians. The great champion of Congregationalism in England, in this century, was Dr. Owen. Among the other world-renowned ornaments of this order are John Milton and John Bunyan, names that will never die, and never cease to be remembered with reverence and affection. Bunyan was a Baptist, but not the less a Congregationalist. Hume, a very disinterested witness, says of the Puritans generally, during this century, the seventeenth: "The precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved by the Puritans; and it was to this sect that the English owed the whole freedom of their constitution."

The world has not yet done justice to the English Puritans. On the accession of Charles II., the anti-Puritan party was far in the ascendency, and had everything their own way. The most arbitrary principles were in favor at the court, and the generous, uncompromising defenders of liberty and the rights of the people against civil and religious despotism were held in great contempt. John Milton lived in retirement, in poverty and neglect; and the great lights of the moral firmament of the nation, that were not in sympathy with the profligate and unprincipled sovereign, were cast down and trodden under foot, and their characters covered with obloquy.

Numerous and extravagant caricatures and gross misrepresentation were made use of, to blacken the Puritan character, and make it odious. To such an extent was this carried, that history

was corrupted, and bears to this day the marks and traces of misconception and misrepresentation on the subject of Puritan principles, character, and doings. But the glorious Redeemer himself drank of the bitter cup of detraction and dishonor; and the servant is not greater than his master.

It is, however, to this for a time despised and slandered class of its people, that England owes to-day, and in modern times, its proud preëminence as the manliest, freest, and mightiest of European nations. But for Puritan resistance to the tyranny of the Stuarts, England would, in all probability, have been to this day Roman Catholic, in no way distinguished from other Roman Catholic countries; or, if the English church had retained its independence, it would have been in no degree superior to the Papacy in respect to its doctrines of human liberty, or the simplicity and purity of its worship. The Congregationalist Puritans did not gain all that they sought. But they did not labor in vain, or spend their strength for naught. Had they succeeded, and accomplished their high purpose of thoroughly reforming both the church and state, not the fortunes of England only, but those of Europe, would have been very different from what they now are, and far more glorious. But the set time to grant Zion that favor had not come; and England has been advancing with more slow and toilsome steps, in the same direction, from the accession of William till now. She is advancing still, and almost every year secures some new concession to justice and the rights of the people, on the part of the British throne and the aristocratic supremacy.

The same result which was aimed at by the Congregational Puritans is being gradually and surely attained. They wanted nothing unreasonable, nothing impracticable; they wanted justice, equal rights, and the most unshackled liberty to worship God.

The failure and defeat of Congregational Puritanism was disastrous, but it still had in it something of the sublime. In its fall truth and righteousness and reason fell, to be covered with obloquy, indeed, for a time; the Lord of life once experienced a

fall of the same kind; but ere long to rise again, glorious and immortal. The short-sighted enemies of human freedom supposed that they had gained a permanent triumph, and exulted in their supposed advantage. But God was preparing in the distance a still more glorious victory for his cause, and a long succession of triumphs.

Israel was not led at once into Canaan, even after the exodus and its wonders, but was under discipline forty years in the wilderness. God is not slack, as some men are subjects of slackness. So, on the other hand, he is never the subject of improper haste, in the accomplishment of his purposes. He announced the kingdom and conquests of the Messiah, and waited four thousand years to prepare the world fully for his advent. Then, and not till then, he came. When the fallow ground is fully broken up, he casts in the precious seed. When the harvest is ripe, he gathers it.

Great organic changes in human society are made slowly and with difficulty. The aim of the Congregational Puritans of the time of Cromwell was to reörganize society from its foundations, and build it up on new principles. They wanted, not only democracy in the church, and republicanism in the state, but they wanted both to be administered on thoroughly Christian principles, for the glory of God and the happiness of man. That these were the aims of the English Congregational Puritans, is evident from the professed principles, and the doings of their leaders in England, and from the history of cotemporary Puritan emigrations to this country, and their doings here. More sublime and godlike aims never occupied the human mind, never engaged the human heart. That all were not entirely agreed in respect to the precise method of accomplishing their aims, or the precise arrangements to enter into that renovated condition of the world which they desired, is not strange. Disagreement on those vast and numerous objects was inevitable. It was also inevitable that much shadowy conception and vague speculation should be mixed with clearer and better views.

Besides, the Congregational cause was peculiarly unfortunate in Cromwell. That great adventurer did not fully comprehend its objects and mission. He may have understood it in part, and have felt the force of its general protest against the specific oppressions and abuses of the times. He saw that the evils of which the Puritans complained were evils, and that they demanded correction. But he did not comprehend their relation to their common parent and cause, civil and ecclesiastical despotism. He thought they arose from abused and perverted despotisms, and could be remedied by improved administrations of the same system. Hence he interpolated in the despotisms of the Stuarts a counter and overpowering despotism of his own. He was even more a despot, under the title of Lord Protector, than James VI. and Charles I. had been, under the titles of hereditary monarchs. He was unfortunately accepted by the Congregational Puritans as the great instrument of Providence to secure the ascendency of their principles, a despotic head of the church and state democracy. During his administration he was, to some extent, the patron of this party. He was its protector, in common with all parties. But his protection was that of a friendly despot.

The nation was not satisfied; neither the friends of democracy, nor others. The relation of Cromwell to all parties was that of a master; peculiarly unacceptable to the royalist party, as an adventurer, with no hereditary claims to the honors and emoluments of royalty; and entirely unsatisfactory to the democratic party, as a despot of the most absolute and unscrupulous kind, treading under foot all the cherished maxims of democracy. At his death the nation might have righted itself, and the cause of liberty have gained something by stipulating for a constitutional government of some kind, monarchical or democratic; or, combining these elements in certain fixed and definite proportions, had the Congregational Puritans been sustained by the Presbyterians. But, unfortunately, they were not; and a misjudged coalition of the Presbyterians, then in the ascendency,

and easily holding the balance of power, with the friends of monarchical and Episcopal despotism, by the recall of Charles II. surrendered all the fruits of the civil war and the commonwealth, and set everything back essentially in the same condition as under Charles I. and James VI.

Of this retrogression England repented at her leisure, and, from the accession of William III., prince of Orange, till the present time, it has been slowly retracing those back steps, and approximating towards the magnificent and attractive ideal of the Congregational Puritans in church and state.

The recovery of English Congregationalism from the shock it received at the accession of Charles II., in 1660, and the injuries it suffered during his reign, was slow and difficult. The public mind had been corrupted, and great pains had been taken to prejudice the nation against republican principles in the church and state. The signal failure of the revolution under Cromwell had the effect to increase this prejudice, as though democracy was something in its nature impracticable. But dissent has been steadily gaining ground in England ever since the act of toleration, and must, at no distant day, become overpowering.

In 1772 the Congregationalist churches in England were estimated at seven hundred and ninety-nine, in Wales two hundred and twenty-five; in all, one thousand and twenty-four. Their number had nearly doubled in thirty years. The Presbyterians at the same time, 1772, had two hundred and fifty churches in England, and eighteen in Wales, making in all two hundred and seventy. This was a great falling off from the predominance and general popularity of Presbyterianism in the early days of the Westminster Assembly, 1643—1648.

Excluded from the great English universities, the English Congregationalists have established independent colleges at Homerton, near London, Hoxton and Hackney, and have several other literary institutions of some importance.

By the recent census of 1851, it appears that the entire population of England and Wales, at that time, was seventeen mil-

lion nine hundred and twenty-seven thousand six hundred and nine; and those who attended public worship in all the different churches, ten million eight hundred and ninety-six thousand and sixty-six, leaving seven million thirty-one thousand five hundred and forty-three who did not attend public religious worship at all; a most alarming indication of the prevalence of irreligion in that most Christian country. Of the religious portion of the population, five million two hundred and ninety-two thousand five hundred and fifty-one attended worship in the church of England churches; and five million six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifteen, in the various dissenting churches. So that a majority of the actual religious worshippers of England and Wales is with the dissenters, and not with the establishment. Church of England religion, with all its superior advantages of court patronage and aristocratic favor, is not the religion of the British people. The nation gives a numerical majority of three hundred thousand nine hundred and sixty-four in favor of dissenting churches.

It appears from the same authority, the census of 1851, that, of the various dissenting bodies, the Methodists are ahead of all the rest, and next to them the Congregationalists. The Methodist worshippers number one million five hundred and forty-four thousand five hundred and twenty-eight, and the Congregationalists one million two hundred and fourteen thousand and fifty-nine. The Unitarians are fifty thousand strong.

The Congregationalists in England were never more active, nor their cause more prosperous, than at the present time. Their benevolent societies for the propagation of the Gospel are numerous and efficient. The London Missionary Society has one hundred and sixty-seven missionaries employed in China, India, the West Indies and other foreign countries, and six hundred natives. The [London] Home Missionary Society is laboring efficiently for the extension of Congregationalism at home, and has one hundred and twenty-two stations in England and Wales.

At the present time there are one thousand eight hundred and

fifty-three Congregationalist churches in England, four hundred and sixty-three in Wales, one hundred and three in Scotland, twenty-four in Ireland, and seventy-eight in the British provinces; in all, two thousand five hundred and twenty-one. The number of Congregationalist churches in England and Wales is two thousand three hundred and sixteen. This is a large number to have grown up since 1688, in a period of one hundred and sixty-six years. These churches have grown up under all the disadvantages of a powerful government patronage given to a rival state establishment. Great and unreasonable prejudices have been excited against them, and they have been the objects of great superciliousness on the part of the established church and its particular friends; but, under all these disadvantages, they have grown to be numerous and powerful, and are still growing and increasing in popularity.

The foregoing estimates are probably below the truth. A recent English paper makes the number of English Congregationalist churches to be two thousand. All accounts agree in representing this class of Christians as worthy descendants of the Congregational Puritans of earlier times, and as being considerably on the increase.

CHAPTER VI.

THE INTRODUCTION OF CONGREGATIONALISM IN AMERICA.

Congregationalism was driven to this country by persecution. There was in its case a fulfilment of the prophecy contained in Rev. 12: 14, 15, 16, "And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place; where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent. And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman,

that he might cause her to be carried away with the flood. And the earth helped the woman; and opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth."

The woman, in this passage, is supposed to represent the true church of God, driven away into retirement before the persecuting power of pagan Rome. It symbolizes the same church driven away before the persecuting power of the same dragon, under the guise of religion, in Papal Rome. It also describes with equal precision the banishment of our pilgrim Puritan fathers from England by the religious despotism of those times, when there was given them the wings of a great eagle to fly away to this then wilderness, to be nourished in retirement for a time, far away from the dragon of persecution that threatened to destroy them in their father-land.

The first emigration to New England was an emigration of the church, and an emigration to the wilderness. It consisted of Puritans of eminent piety and virtue, and many of them distinguished for learning and refinement, who could not conscientiously submit to the then prevailing religious despotism of England. Not only were the first emigrants English Puritans; they were Puritans of the most radical character in respect to their notions of reform both in church and state, and most irreconcilably opposed to corruption and injustice, and every species of vice and sin.

They were regarded by the prudent conservatives of the time as raving fanatics, on the borders of lunacy; as men of impracticable theories, who could not hear to reason and expediency; and as revolutionists and destructives in church and state, who must either be crushed and crippled or banished, in order that peace and security might be attained. They were represented in the most odious lights, caricatured and charged with all kinds of absurdities and inconsistencies, and their banishment and removal accounted a great public benefit. Such was the estimate of the Independents in the corrupt and arbi-

trary courts of the English sovereigns of this period; and those sovereigns were well pleased to see them leave England for these then distant shores and wilds of America, to waste their zeal, and wear out their lives, under the hardships of a new settlement.

Having emigrated with his church to Holland, and resided with them in that country, and not finding their residence there satisfactory, John Robinson and his adherents returned to England, and a portion of them emigrated to New England, where they landed on Plymouth rock, December 20, 1620. They were earnest, eminently pious, and devoted to the love and service of God, and governed by the most upright and generous principles in their deportment towards men, according to their understanding of the true interests and happiness of the human race. No narrow selfishness, no debasing vices, were allowed to warp their judgment, or blind their minds to the perception of the true and good. They were fallible, like other men, and liable to err; but their views were high and honorable, and their errors, whatever they were, were more errors of the head, than of the heart.

The landing on Plymouth rock, considered as the first of a long succession of religious emigrations, was one of the most important events, not in the history of this country only, but in the history of any country.

In that emigration came the great principles of Christianity, associated with enlarged views of men's *rights* and *capabilities*. And the problem to be solved was the great problem of ages, how much liberty can safely be intrusted to the masses of the human family, both in church and state.

The first emigrants to New England were republicans in both. Their motto was, "A church without a bishop, and a state without a king." They came to these shores to make an application of their theories both in respect to church and state, and to bring their principles to the test of experiment; the most stupendous experiment of ages, and in its results the most beneficent and glorious.

They landed further north than they designed, and on less auspicious shores; winter had commenced his iron reign, and they were poorly provided to meet its hardships; but, with many prayers and some tears, they laid the foundations of a new empire of civil and religious freedom, unprecedented and unparalleled in all the ages of the past.

They took for their rule of construction the word of God, and made it their earnest and prayerful endeavor to conform the church and state to its teachings.

Their northern landing, remote from other settlements, made on different principles, and the severe climate and sterile soil of that region, probably all contributed in the end to the success of their experiment.

Before leaving the Mayflower, and before setting foot on the shore, the heads of families, forty-one in number, with one hundred and one members, signed a solemn covenant, forming themselves into a body politic, for the purpose of making equal laws for the general good. They agreed that a governor should be chosen *annually*, and that the sovereign power should be vested in the *whole body of the people*. This was in the reign of James VI., when the most despotic principles were in the ascendency in England, and throughout nearly the whole of Europe; and thirty years previous to the experiment of the Commonwealth in England, under Cromwell.

Immediately after landing, having first paid their public and united homage to the Sovereign Ruler of all nations and churches, by fervent prayer and praise, they erected such huts as they could for their immediate accommodation, and protected themselves as well as they could against the rigors of the season. But they were exposed to great hardships, and before the next summer *half* their whole number perished.

But the survivors were not disheartened. They had taken possession of their new world in the name of God, and for the advancement and glory of his kingdom, and they had no thought of abandoning their object. The survivors improved their con-

veniences during the summer, and the next winter made themselves more comfortable. They soon received additions from the Old World of others of like principles and spirit, and in 1630 their number was increased to three thousand.

In 1627 another Congregationalist emigration came to Salem, and formed a new settlement there, and an independent civil establishment. Three hundred more came over in 1629, one hundred of whom removed to Charlestown.

In 1630 more than fifteen hundred persons came over, and founded Boston, and several adjacent towns. Many of these were of illustrious and noble families, but were zealous Congregationalists and republicans.

The leading objects of these emigrations were religious and philanthropic. Disgusted with the despotism and oppressions of Europe, both in church and state, the Puritans desired to reconstruct both church and state on better principles.

Regarding the Bible as the great oracle of political wisdom, as well as of ecclesiastical expediency, they desired to found a religious commonwealth on its principles, and to correspond as nearly as might be to the commonwealth of the Israelites, from the time of Moses to that of Samuel. In pursuance of this object, they ordained, in the general court, in 1631, that none but church-members should enjoy the elective franchise, or have any participation in the government.

In 1634 the settlements about Boston abandoned their hitherto democratic organization, and established a *representative* government, by delegates, in which they delegated the authority of the people to a general court of twenty-four representatives. This court was the germ of the assemblies in the colonial and state legislatures that have followed, and the adaptation of democracy to the increasing numbers of the people, and the increasing extent of their settlements.

The settlement of New Hampshire was commenced in 1632, and the first house was built at Portsmouth, in 1631. In 1641 the little republics in New Hampshire united with Massachusetts, forming a single larger republic.

Connecticut began to be settled from Plymouth colony, at the invitation of the Indians residing there, in 1633. Settlements were begun at Wethersfield and Windsor in 1635.

In 1637 two large ships from England arrived at Boston, having on board Mr. Davenport, Eaton, and others of wealth and distinction. Wishing to found a new community after their own peculiar ideas of scriptural authority, the emigrants of this arrival went the next year, 1638, to Quinnipiac, which they called New Haven, and established a new settlement there. Immediately after their arrival, they observed a day of fasting and prayer, and had a sermon from Mr. Davenport "On the temptation in the wilderness." They then subscribed a plantation covenant, engaging, among other things, till otherwise ordered, to be governed in all things, civil as well as religious, by the Scriptures.

The next year, 1639, they met in a large barn, and established their civil and religious polity. They ordained that none but church-members should be allowed to vote or hold office in the state; that civil magistrates should be elected annually, by all duly-authorized voters; and that the word of God should be the supreme law of the commonwealth.

Other settlements were organized in a similar manner, and on similar principles, and united together in representative legislatures to enact laws for the common good.

Among the early settlers of New England were many eminent theologians and accomplished scholars, some of them educated in the universities of England; and they united and directed their utmost exertions to build up a great Christian community, all of whose concerns should be administered on the principles of the Gospel. They held to the independency of single churches, and the sovereign right of each to determine ultimately all questions of doctrine or discipline, as the only system conformable to the Scriptures, and the most favorable to the liberties of the membership, and the purity of the whole body. They vested the entire power of the church, as a

spiritual community, legislative, judicial and executive, in the *brethren assembled* and organized under their pastors and stated supplies, as moderators in church meetings; but, at the same time, they allowed their courts the benefits of advisory councils either of ministers, or ministers and delegates, both stated and occasional, and gave such councils jurisdiction both over the ministers whom they examined and ordained, settled and unsettled, and suspended or deposed, as cases seemed to require; thus introducing a virtual confederacy of ministers and churches for mutual advice and improvement, and establishing superior courts for the supervision of churches and ministers.

But, notwithstanding their extreme anxiety to maintain liberty and justice in church and state, the New England Congregationalists did not entirely escape the infection of intolerance.

Roger Williams was banished from Massachusetts, for his religious and moral principles, in 1635, and became the founder of Rhode Island. Two years later, in 1637, Mrs. Hutchinson, another innovator on the established order of things, and some of her followers, suffered a like banishment. The same colony banished the Quakers, in 1656; and, this not proving effectual, the legislature, by the majority of a single vote, ordered such as returned from banishment, and persisted in forcing themselves upon the colony, to be put to death. Four executions occurred under this sanguinary law, the convicts refusing to accept a commutation of their punishment for voluntary banishment. Public sympathy now became aroused, and these persecuting laws, so contrary to the general principles and spirit of Congregationalism, were greatly relaxed, and the worst of them repealed. Harvard College was founded in 1636 by the appropriation of one thousand dollars from the government, and was endowed with three thousand dollars by Rev. John Harvard, a Congregationalist minister of Charlestown, at his death, in 1638; in consequence of which it was called by his name.

Yale College was founded in 1700. Both were founded as

schools of the church, and seminaries of education for its ministry.

At the time of its rigid exclusion of Baptists and Quakers from the colony, Massachusetts enacted severe laws against Episcopacy; and Episcopalian petitioners for liberty to exercise their religion, and the privileges of citizens, were answered with fines and imprisonment.

In all the early New England settlements, the ministers were supported, and the expenses of public worship provided for, by taxation. This was deemed just and equitable. Besides, none but church-members were admitted to have the rank of freemen or citizens, with a right to vote and hold offices. As the settlements progressed, it was found expedient to extend the right of citizenship to all the inhabitants, without respect to their religious professions, and the support of the Gospel was devolved on the voluntary contributions of its friends. This is called the voluntary system, in opposition to that by the government, which is called the compulsory system.

The religious qualification for citizenship tended to the corruption of religion, by inducing hypocritical professions; and was found to be, on many accounts, objectionable; in consequence of which, it was abandoned.

The voluntary system of supporting the Gospel is adapted to all countries and conditions; and, though it affords opportunity for the miserly and avaricious to refuse their due share of contribution for this object, it is undoubtedly justified both by the Scriptures and by the highest expediency.

In proportion as the Gospel takes effect, it will dispose men to contribute liberally for its support; and a pure Gospel will tend powerfully to this result.

The New England colonies always purchased their lands of the Indians, and aimed to deal justly and kindly with them. But various collisions arose, and cruel Indian wars were added to their other trials. Besides, the colonists were frequently obliged to defend their chartered rights and privileges against the Eng-

lish crown, which was continually attempting to impose new restrictions upon them, and to reduce them to a state of vassalage. In both these conflicts the colonists were obliged to unite together for the purpose of supporting each other; and their frequent struggles and trials proved invaluable preparations for that mighty struggle for national independence and republicanism that was accomplished by the revolutionary war in 1775—1782.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PROGRESS AND FRUITS OF CONGREGATIONALISM IN AMERICA.

After a period of general religious declension and formality, in 1760, there was a great revival of religious interest, under Jonathan Edwards and others, by which the churches were greatly enlarged and strengthened. During the revolutionary war, the public mind was too much diverted by the exciting incidents and imminent dangers of the time, to allow of any remarkable progress in the religion of the country. The churches, however, generally held their own during that dark and perilous period, and performed invaluable services to the cause of liberty, by their steady inculcation of the great lessons of piety and virtue, and their strenuous advocacy of the great doctrines of liberty and justice.

The Congregationalists were the fathers of American liberty and republicanism. Republicanism was one of their great ideas, and the reformation of the state in conformity with this idea was regarded by them as a part of their Heaven-appointed mission. They attempted it in England, and failed, under Cromwell. The established itinerants and organizations of despotism were too strong for them, and Cromwell was not true to the Congregationalist mission. Under the name of liberty he established an iron despotism, superseding one despotism by another.

The Presbyterians were generally monarchists. They wanted a limited monarchy, corresponding to their limited and modified episcopacy; but, as the government and supremacy of the people did not enter into their religious system, no more did it into their political one. Their influence turned the scale in favor of monarchy in England, at the close of the protectorate. They might have given the country a president, holding his appointment for a term of years; and they might have contributed to institute a representative legislature, appointed by the whole people, according to the views of the Congregationalist republicans. But they did not want anything of the kind. They wanted a hereditary sovereignty and aristocracy; and accordingly, by their influence, the English monarchy was restored and reëstablished in 1660.

Had not the Congregationalists come to this country; had they not been driven here by the relentless persecution of the English sovereigns, and been made willing to encounter every possible hardship, as exiled apostles of liberty and religion, rather than conform to the ritual of civil and religious despotism at home, the American republic would never have existed.

How amazing are the ways of Providence! On what wheels within wheels move the course of human events, making, in many cases, the blood of the martyrs the seed of the church, and the tyrant persecutors of liberty and piety the unintentional founders of a new empire of civil and religious freedom!

The early Presbyterianism of this country became favorable to republicanism through the force of circumstances which it did not originate, and through Congregational influences.

Massachusetts began its contest with the English government in favor of *colonial rights* in 1763, under George III. The first colonial congress was convened at New York, Oct. 7, 1765. Committees of correspondence, to arouse the whole country to united resistance of English tyranny, were first appointed at Boston; and these extended through the colonies in 1772. The introduction of tea, on which a tax was demanded without the

consent of the colonial legislature, was forcibly resisted at Boston, and three hundred and forty-two chests broken open, and emptied into the sea, Dec. 18, 1773; and the first blood in the revolutionary war was shed in the battle of Lexington, near Boston, April 19th, 1775. Directly after this, on the 25th of June, 1775, followed the hard-fought battle of Bunker Hill, in which the determined bravery and energy of the Americans secured to a defeat the ordinary benefits of a glorious victory. The battle of Bunker Hill was lost, but the cause was gained.

The first offensive operations of the British, in the revolutionary war, were made in New England; and the courageous spirit and determined resistance which they met from the sons of New England were an essential condition of the success of the American cause in that mighty struggle.

New England bore a large part in all the conflicts and sacrifices of the revolutionary war, and also in the councils of the nation by which it was directed and carried on; and her example and influence were decisive in favor of the general adoption of republican governments throughout the colonies.

Nor was this all. Congregationalism was not restricted to New England. It was disseminated in the Baptist order throughout the south, and wherever it was carried it served as a leader of republicanism in the state.

Jefferson, one of the framers of the constitution, is said to have made the Congregational government of a Christian church the model to which he aimed to conform, as far as might be, the government of the nation.

All connection between the Congregational churches in New England and the state terminated during the revolutionary war and subsequently, and religious liberty has long been perfect in every part of the United States.

Congregationalism, except with the Baptists, did not extend much beyond New England till the commencement of the nineteenth century. Those who emigrated west or south generally connected themselves with Presbyterian churches, and their Con-

gregationalism was absorbed and lost in Presbyterianism. For the more convenient coëxistence of both orders in the same field, a plan of union was adopted between the general assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States and the general association of Connecticut, whereby Congregationalist churches were allowed to be connected with presbyteries, and to have a representation by lay delegates in all Presbyterian church courts.

The practical operation of this plan was gradually to lead Congregational churches to the adoption of Presbyterianism, and it has contributed to extend the latter at the expense of the former.

Like most amalgamations, however, of heterogeneous elements, it has proved unsatisfactory to both parties. It was discarded by the Old School assembly after its excision of the New School portion of the general body in 1837; and, though recognized as still in force by the New School assembly at Washington, in 1852, was disapproved by the general Congregational convention at Albany in the same year, and is nearly abandoned by all parties.

It is principally objectionable, in the view of strict Presbyterians, as introducing a foreign element into the Presbyterian courts, and tending to weaken the general attachment to Presbyterianism. But it is discountenanced by Congregationalists as tending to produce the gradual defection of Congregational churches from the principles of their order, and gradually attaching them to the principles and usages of Presbyterianism.

Since 1840, Congregationalism has been considerably revived in parts of the Middle and Western States, where it had previously been planted, and many new churches, associations and conventions, formed. It is multiplying its congregations in most of the considerable cities of the Middle and Western States, and bids fair to become a powerful rival of Presbyterianism in this part of the country. It only waits to have its system completed by the addition of a stated national convention, to meet annually, or at regular intervals of three or four years, in which state associations, conferences, conventions, &c., can be repre-

sented; and to have established by this national court a set of church-boards to conduct the various charitable enterprises of the church, by its authority, and to serve, in various ways, as a bond of union and agreement between the widely-separated branches of this body, in order for it to commence a new era of prosperity and usefulness in this country.

Till the recent revival of denominational interest in this body, since 1840, the Congregationalists have done very little for the extension of their polity, out of New England, but have been content, for the most part, that Presbyterianism should have undivided control of the west and south. But recently a better spirit has prevailed, and the extension of the Congregational polity everywhere is deemed a matter of vital interest to the general cause of liberty and religion. Efforts are accordingly made everywhere for this purpose, and they have generally been crowned with remarkable success.

It used to be thought that Congregationalism was only adapted to New England, and that its success there was owing to causes that could not be put in operation elsewhere; but this is found to be a mistake. The success of the system anywhere is owing, under God, to the principles on which it is founded; and they are equally operative in all places, and among all people.

The greatest calamity that has befallen American Congregationalism has been the defection of the Unitarians. This has not been confined to the Congregational churches of New England; it commenced in the Presbyterian church of Switzerland, as early as 1757. The catechism of Calvin was superseded by a Unitarian catechism, in Switzerland, in 1788; other changes were made in favor of Unitarianism in 1807; and in 1830, of twenty-seven pastors, all but two or three held Unitarian sentiments.

Similar defections have occurred among the Presbyterians in France and England. The adoption of Unitarian views began in New England, simultaneously with their prevalence in Switzerland, France and England. Books and articles began to be

written in New England, favorable to Unitarianism, as early as 1756. One of the Episcopal churches of Boston became Unitarian in 1785; in 1805, the subject of the divinity of Christ was extensively debated, and many clergymen and churches in the Congregational connection took sides against it. This revolution in favor of Unitarianism continued till about 1816, since which time it has been arrested. But, in the course of this defection, Cambridge university was taken over to the Unitarians, with a large number of ministers and churches.

This defection in New England operated for a time to prejudice the public mind against Congregationalism as a system of church polity. It was imputed to some defect or internal weakness in the church; and this notwithstanding that the same thing had taken place among Presbyterians in Switzerland, France, and England. This impression is undoubtedly a prejudice, with no valid foundation in fact, and, as such, is passing away.

The great liberty of opinion allowed by Congregationalism to its ministry and membership undoubtedly exposes it to defections of this kind; but its thorough study of the Bible, and free discussion of all its principles, in the meetings of its members and ministers, with its scriptural discipline, are adequate principles of conservation and recovery from error. With an open Bible for its rule of faith, with a learned, earnest and eminently pious ministry, devoting their lives to the study and exposition of the Bible, beseeching God continually for his grace to guide their judgments, and his spirit to purify their hearts, the Congregational order, with all its progressiveness, is believed to be not inferior to any other order, in capacity to hold the truth, and resist the aggression of dangerous errors and delusions.

The Congregationalist Unitarians, having deviated widely from the sublime faith of their fathers, on the subject of the nature and work of Christ, and the authority of the Scriptures as a supreme rule of faith, are believed to be on their return, if not to their former system of Christian theology, to one which has much greater affinities with it than that which they have for a time embraced.

No denomination has done better service to the cause of Christian theology, within the last hundred years, than the Congregational. Edwards, Hopkins, Dwight, Emmons, and others, occupy places in the highest rank of Christian ministers and theologians.

Nathaniel W. Taylor, of New Haven, Connecticut, follows Dr. Dwight and Emmons in the line of theological progress, calling the entire Congregational order, and all Calvinistic orders generally, to more profound and just views of Christian theology, in some of its most recondite doctrines, than had ever before been attained in these connections. In future ages, the men that refer with approbation to the names of Edwards and Dwight, as the great ministers of Congregationalism, of the progress of theology, and of the progress of the human race, will not omit from the same high place in men's estimates and regards the equally worthy name of *Nathaniel W. Taylor*.

The American Temperance reformation had its origin in the Congregational churches, and this not by a fortunate accident, but as a natural offspring of Congregational principles and measures. It could not have originated among Episcopalians. It has, indeed, met but a moderate degree of favor with that order. It could hardly have had its origin among Presbyterians, although this order has coöperated vigorously in carrying it forward.

The aggressive character of Congregationalism, and its general principles of associated and combined action in the church, led naturally to the idea of combining and concentrating the action of members against the use of alcoholic liquors at first, and then against all traffic in them as drinks.

The Congregational churches of New England were the original proposers of the American system of common schools for the whole people. Congregationalism demands general intelligence, and has been a powerful promoter of general and classical learning.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONGREGATIONAL CONSTITUTIONS AND CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

All societies must have constitutions or systems of union and coöperation. The Christian church had such from the beginning, although they do not appear at first to have been reduced to writing. All the revolutionary churches of modern times have bestowed considerable attention on their constitutions. These relate chiefly to government and faith. The fundamental organic law of church government is usually denominated its constitution, and comprehends its confession of faith or declaration of Christian doctrines. Each church makes its own.

The primitive creeds of Christianity appear to have been very brief and simple. They comprehended a belief in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of men; in the Holy Scriptures as the word of God; in the Holy Spirit as the sanctifier of men through the truth; and in the doctrines of the Scriptures as generally understood and taught in those times. As new opinions came to be proposed and discussed, new articles were added to the primitive creed of Christianity, to embrace what was supposed to be true and important, and to exclude what was supposed to be erroneous. Numerous canons of faith, as well as of church order, were added in successive centuries by the general councils, till the decrees of the council of Trent, settling the faith of Catholic Christendom, in 1545—1563, constituted a considerable volume, prescribing, among other things, the celibacy of the clergy, the equal authority of the Scriptures and tradition, the canonical authority of the Apocrypha, auricular confession and absolution, communion in our kind only,

the cup being withheld from the laity, the continuance of miracles, the worship of images and relics, the intercession of saints, and assenting to the adoration and immaculate conception of the virgin Mary, purgatory, and transubstantiation, or the conversion of the bread of the Eucharist into the actual body of Christ, by consecration.

The Lutherans embodied their faith in the Augsburg confession, in 1530; the German Presbyterians theirs, in the Heidelburg catechism, and other formularies; the Westminster confession of faith and discipline are the platform of Anglo-American and Scotch Presbyterianism, and the supreme organic law of the churches adopting them. Congregationalism is built less on human constitutions and confessions, and more on the Bible, than any other systems. Its earliest confession of faith is that which was drawn up by John Robinson, and published at Leyden, 1619. Next follows the Savoy confession, adopted by the ministers and delegates of the Congregational churches of England, more than one hundred in number, at their meeting at the Savoy, London, Oct. 12, 1658. The Savoy confession was copied, with slight alterations, from that of the Westminster assembly. This has generally been received as expressing the faith of Congregationalists, since the time of its adoption. With some slight alterations, it was adopted by the New England synod, at Boston, in 1680, and has ever been regarded as one of the standards of New England theology. It is not, however, imposed by authority, and cannot be, without an entire abandonment of the principles of Congregationalism. Each church frames and adopts its own confession of faith and system of polity, and changes and modifies both according to its own sovereign will and judgment of scriptural truth and Christian expediency. Nor is there any earthly power, to say, authoritatively, Why do ye so? or to command differently.

The Bible is the Congregationalist confession of faith and constitution. It is the highest and sole supreme organic church law of Congregationalism; and has no other enforcement than what

arises from the counsel and advice of sister churches and the providence of God. It wants no other. This is enough, and far better than more. Congregationalism, in this respect, bases itself on the assumption that the Bible is an intelligible book, adapted to the human understanding; that its essential doctrines are matters of certainty, not of opinion merely; and that honest inquirers, being fully competent, by the grace of God, to understand them, must understand them alike. A competent judge cannot be directed, authoritatively, how he should decide litigated questions of law, nor a juror how he shall decide questions of fact. The judge must decide according to his knowledge of law, and according to the law itself; and the juror must decide according to the evidence, of which he is sole judge.

So, in religion, every man is made a judge for himself, according to his knowledge and ability, both of the scriptural principles of doctrine and church order; and no man may lawfully relinquish his fundamental rights and duties in this respect. According to his ability and opportunities he must judge what is right and true, and must act upon his judgments. To do less than this is to be proportionably less than the noble beings that God designed us to be; and to expose ourselves to endless impositions and delusions, as well as to unlimited oppressions.

It has been a great question, among Congregationalists, how far diversities of opinion and imperfections of religious faith and knowledge ought to be tolerated in the church. This question met all the early Protestant reformers, and was decided by them variously, but with a strong leaning to Popish illiberality and intolerance. The Pope had undertaken to prescribe the precise limits beyond which dissent should not be allowed, under his jurisdiction. The world acquiesced in this, and the reformers themseves did not perceive anything wrong in the principle. They only thought that it was carried out wrong. When, therefore, they founded their several new communities, they copied the intolerance of the Papacy, but directed it against different particulars. This is not strange. They were but men; and to

emerge at once from the Egyptian darkness of the Papacy into the blazing light of perfectly unadulterated Christianity, was too much for man. It was not the design of Providence that they should exhaust all the stores of wisdom and divine knowledge, and leave no improvements to be made by their successors. They were enabled to do much. Few have taken such mighty strides in the department of progress as they took. God said by them, as at first, Let there be light, and there was light. They purged the temple of God, and invited back the glorious shechinah of the divine presence and power. God took up his residence among them, and gave them his own mighty arm to lean upon. The blessings of his providence and grace were the seals of his approbation of their work. They served their generation well, and have enrolled their names and embalmed their memories in the hearts of men, as the benefactors of their race.

But they did not finish up the work of God on earth. They could not. It is too great for the men of any age to do. It will engage the abilities and industry of all ages, and tax them to the utmost. The man that undertakes to stop the work of God where they left it, misapprehends entirely its magnitude; and, so far from being a worthy disciple of these men, is the abettor of the very principles which they opposed.

It was a sad defect of the reformation, and a disastrous error of the reformers, that, with all their sublime conceptions of Christian liberty, as they maintained it against Papal intolerance and oppression, they did not understand the wide extent to which it ought to be maintained against themselves, and against one another. Having abolished the despotism of the Papacy, they did not clearly see that the church only wanted the Lordship of Christ. They thought they must settle terms of communion, and rules of faith, which Christ and the apostles had not settled. The great law of church fellowship and communion is contained in Rom. 14 : 1, "Him that is weak in the faith receive, but not to doubtful disputations." Christ received all that came. We hear of no applicants for church privileges being rejected by the

apostles. The weak in faith are the imperfect in faith. Paul tells us that these are to be received with others, as far as they can walk with the church in peace. Beyond this they are to be rejected; and only beyond this.

The Gospel is an institute of faith and knowledge, but it is still more an institute of love and holiness. The church and fold of Christ is for his flock; and all the true members ought to be admissible to the different departments of this fold, as far as they can come in and enjoy its blessings in peace. The strong should easily bear with the weak; the learned with the ignorant; the wiser with the less wise; and the more perfect with the less perfect. The intolerance of the Papacy is its sin and shame, and cries aloud to Heaven for vengeance to be poured out on that corrupt and merciless despotism. But how much more shameful is the intolerance of Protestantism! With an open Bible in hand, and the laws of love and liberty on our lips, and the rights and obligations of independent private judgment on the fore-front of all our religious movements, how can we set up bars and gates to shut out of our own particular enclosures of the church of Christ, the weak and ignorant, and erring in faith, whom, nevertheless, God accepts, and with whom the Holy Spirit deigns to dwell! How can we be guilty of such arrogance and inconsistency! How can we allow ourselves thus to sin against our weak brethren, and put stumbling-blocks both in their way and in the way of sinners! How can we so belie our professions, and dishonor our Master, whose living and dying charge it was, that we should love one another as he loved us; and whose prayer it was, in the immediate view of his crucifixion, that we all may be one, even as he and the Father are one; that we may be one in them! John 17 : 21.

At the commencement of the Protestant reformation, and subsequently, the Protestants divided and formed themselves into different communions, many of which had no fellowship with others. Calvinists had no communion with Arminians, and the church of England had none with dissenters. The church of

England still persists in its absurd attitude of withdrawing from all communion with dissenting churches. Contemptible arrogance and impiety! It regards dissenters, practically, as its rivals and enemies, and the enemies of God and man. A portion of the Presbyterians still retain the same intolerance of Arminianism. But more generally this has passed away; and the disciples of the two systems sit in peace together, at the same communion-tables, and share in common the privileges and blessings of the same churches. Though most intolerant of dissenting communions, the church of England tolerates the greatest diversities of faith in her own connection, and among her members. Her members may believe almost anything, but they must adhere to that church.

When Unitarianism arose, it was made a question, both in Europe and America, whether it should be tolerated as an allowable diversity of opinion, or expose its subjects to separation and excommunication. The subject of the precise character and relations of Christ had been long debated in the ancient church, and had been the occasion of sanguinary wars and persecutions. Some of the most pious and eminent of the ancient fathers had not been sound in the faith on this subject, according to the standards of ancient and modern orthodoxy. The ancient controversy, however, after occupying the attention of the world for some centuries, and engaging the most profound inquiries, had been settled in conformity with the orthodox faith of modern times. The victory had been dearly bought, and stubbornly contested; but it had been clearly, and for a long time, undeniably gained. The Papal church, the Oriental churches, and all the great branches of Protestant Christendom, concurred in regarding the divinity of Christ, not only as a great truth of the Gospel, but one of its most important and distinguishing truths; and with this was associated the doctrine of the Trinity.

Under these circumstances, it is not strange that it was a matter of regret with many that the controversy concerning the

character of Christ should be revived in modern times, and that there was a general disposition to prohibit dissent on this subject in most Protestant churches. The church of England is an exception. Her ritual and ministers have generally taught the Catholic doctrine of the divinity of Christ; but dissent from that doctrine has never been made a disciplinable offence among the membership, and not usually among the ministry. Its policy, in this respect, has been the policy of forbearance. Considerable fault has been found with it by zealous exclusionists of other connections, but no great injury has resulted from it. The doctrine of Christ's divinity is generally held both by the ministry and membership of the church of England notwithstanding its toleration of dissent from it. The toleration of error seldom prejudices the interests of truth. Intolerance often does.

The Presbyterian churches in England, Switzerland and France, adopted the same principle of toleration as the church of England, and Unitarianism gained the ascendency among them. The Presbyterian churches of the United States adopted the opposite prohibition policy. The Congregational churches of New England were at first tolerant of Unitarian views, till, considerable defections having occurred, the subject came up, in 1816, for general discussion, when this toleration was abandoned, and the opposite policy adopted. This was a revolution in the policy of Congregationalism, against which many protested at the time, and concerning which some are doubtful still.

Since this time, the supreme divinity of Christ has not only been generally held by Congregationalists, as it is by church of Englandists and Episcopalians, but has been insisted upon as necessary to membership in the church. The correctness of this, either in respect to principle or policy, admits of being seriously questioned. It is supposed to be the means of great good, in preserving Christianity from radical corruption. The denial of the divinity of Christ is undoubtedly a great error, and an error which, if admitted, leads to many other great and injurious errors. But it is as undoubtedly the error of many noble and ingenuous minds, and of many devout and earnest

Christians. Neither does it necessarily spread in the church, if not prohibited and disciplined. Truth is more than a match for error anywhere, and knowledge is more than a match for ignorance. The safety of truth depends on the clearness of its *evidences*. It asks no aid from authority. It asks only liberty of argument and free discussion, and then advances quietly and surely to victory. Truth asks no advantage in its conflicts. It scorns to fight with a disarmed enemy, or to take a mean advantage of his unfavorable positions. It is invulnerable and immortal, and can afford to be generous. Delusion and ignorance cannot.

Other denominations submit to the dictation of bishops and superior church courts, and have imposed upon them laws and constitutions which they had no hand in framing, and which derive no binding force from their consent. In Congregationalism every church association, convention and conference, makes its own laws, and adopts its own confessions of faith; and the modern confessions of faith are, in many cases, framed so as to allow, on many debated subjects, greater diversities of opinion than were formerly allowed. This does not mark, as a few suppose, the incipient progress of defection and error, but a more Christian liberality, and a reasonable toleration of diversities of opinion in the Christian family.

It marks the progress of knowledge, and the increased confidence of Christians in the word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. The man who deems the Bible insufficient endeavors to supply its deficiencies by supplementary laws and rules of Christian faith. The man who thoroughly trusts the power of truth to stand on its own merits, and to hold its ground and work its way without adventitious aid, stands still, a reverent observer, and witnesses with serene composure its conflicts and victories. His distrustful neighbor views them with alarm and terror. But we need not fear. Truth is much stronger unaided than with the greatest adventitious helps. Its cause is more secure.

CHAPTER IX.

PARTIES IN THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

It is inevitable that there should be diversities of opinion with respect to doctrines and measures in all churches. There are such in the Catholic church, the church of England, the Episcopal church, and the Presbyterian churches. There are also such in the Congregational church, properly so called, and in all the different branches of the Congregational family of churches. The principal diversities of opinion among Congregationalists have respect to theology, and correspond to those which prevail in the other great bodies of Christendom. There are two leading parties, popularly denominated the Old and New School, and corresponding to Old and New School Presbyterians. The Old School are the conservatives in theology, who adhere more strictly to the confessions of faith adopted at the Savoy in London, 1658, and afterwards at Boston, in 1680; and to the Westminster catechism and confession of the Presbyterians. The New School are the innovators in theology, adopting the general system of the Westminster and Savoy divines, but not adhering to it in every particular. Theology has been more progressive in New England, among the Congregationalists, than in any other part of the world in the same time, or in any other connection. Elsewhere it has been stationary; here it has been progressive.

Congregationalism is preëminently a system of progress. It encourages free inquiry and free thinking. Other systems do not. Many of them repress it. As a popular system, Congregationalism is naturally liberal. It allows the exercise of common sense, and common sense demands charity and forbearance.

Considerable diversities of opinion are tolerated without complaint. But all are not equally tolerant; nor is it possible for all to perceive, with accuracy, the precise line of demarkation between opinions that ought to be tolerated without interrupting Christian fellowship, and those which ought to be prohibited, and on account of which Christian fellowship ought to be withdrawn from the erring.

Congregationalism recognizes no creeds nor confessions, and no platforms of government and discipline, as binding rules of faith and practice. Richard Mather says: They have a platform constituted by a profession of their faith, but not a binding rule of faith and practice. J. Cotton says: When a church is suspected and slandered with corrupt and unsound doctrine, they have a call from God to set forth a public confession of their faith; but to prescribe the same, as the confession of the faith of that church, to their posterity, sad experience has shown what a snare it has been. The same principles are advanced by the Congregational union of England and Wales, as late as 1833. Cotton Mather says of the New England churches: It is the design of these churches to make the terms of communion as parallel as may be, with the terms of salvation. Doctor Watts maintains that churches should admit all who make a credible profession of religion. The Plymouth church covenanted to walk in a church state, in all God's ways made known, or to be made known; and reserved an entire, perpetual liberty of searching the inspired records, and forming their opinions and practices according to them. — Congregational Dictionary, pp. 125—134, on Creeds.

The Congregational creeds and confessions declare what is and has been believed, not what shall be. A liberty of dissent is generally recognized and freely used. But there are limits beyond which diversities of opinion are not allowed. If a minister is suspected to depart from the essential principles of Protestant orthodoxy, and to be unworthy of being longer sustained in the connection, he has a trial by the authority of his church, as-

sisted by a mutual or exparte council. As the result of such a trial, he is acquitted or condemned, and, if condemned, deposed. He is judged, not by the Savoy and Boston confessions, nor by any other ancient or modern symbols of the church, but by the word of God alone, its perfect and supreme law. Such a court may judge incorrectly. They may sometimes condemn the innocent and clear the guilty; but it is believed that no other general arrangement can operate, on the whole, better. Errors and imperfections are incident to all man's doings.

A considerable conservative tendency has been developed in New England of late, in harmony with Old School Presbyterianism. It has sometimes seemed to threaten a division, and the separation of the Congregational order into two rival and opposing bodies, corresponding to the Old and New School Presbyterians. A few would be glad to accomplish such a result. But the great body of Congregationalists not only esteem the brethren that differ most from themselves on these points, too highly, to be willing to be separated from them on such an account, but judge that the differences are no just cause of separation.

The responsibility of ministers to the churches in their corporate capacity, and not to any higher and remote courts, is clearly evinced in the New Testament. The apostle Peter was called to account, by the brethren of Jerusalem, for preaching the Gospel to Cornelius, and justified himself to them by a full account of the matter, showing that he had acted by divine direction. — Acts 11 : 2—18. Paul directs the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse : Say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it; and he admonishes his Galatian brethren to discipline and cut off from the church false teachers that were troubling them. — Gal. 5 : 10—12.

The diversities of faith among Congregationalists are not greater than are tolerated in the church of England, the Episcopal church of the United States, and the Presbyterian churches. The division of the Presbyterians on account, in part, of doc-

trinal differences, has done no real good, but has resulted in much harm. Each of the great Presbyterian churches has the same diversities of faith which the whole had before the division; and will continue to have them, if they should divide a dozen times more. Any division not demanded by fundamental principles is chargeable with the sin of schism, and is productive of great evil.

Intolerance among Christians of reasonable diversities of Christian faith has been one of the greatest errors of modern times, and has brought infinite reproach on the Protestant cause. It greatly impeded the progress of the reformation at first, and has hindered both its completion and general prevalence since. While pretending the greatest zeal for the honor of God and the purity of religion, it is itself the grossest corruption. It betrays the cause of God with a kiss, and stabs it to the heart, with professions of love on its lips. It is amazing that the world has been so long in getting its eyes open to the enormous wickedness of this procedure. But a brighter day is breaking, not only with respect to the accuracy and extent of Christian knowledge, but also with respect to a reasonable indulgence of the ignorant, the weak and erring. Uniformity in faith, and equality in superior knowledge and discernment, are very desirable indeed; but Christian charity and mercy are far greater and better. With all the importance of Christianity as an institute of knowledge, it has a transcendently greater importance as an institute of love and general holiness.

CHAPTER X.

THE CORRUPTION OF CONGREGATIONALISM.

CONGREGATIONALISM, as a system of church democracy, is corrupted when any foreign element is introduced into it. Its principal liabilities to corruption are from Presbyterianism. Many imagine that the two systems are essentially the same, with only slight, unimportant differences between them. But this is a great mistake. The two systems are fundamentally different. Presbyterianism is a modified episcopacy; and both are modified despotisms of the hierarchical or sacred order-kind. Enlightened Congregationalism abhors those principles, as having been the source of incalculable evils to mankind, and as liable to reproduce them in all times and in all countries.

The essential elements of Congregationalism are two: 1, The democratic government of the church by its membership, or by persons holding their appointment from the membership, and accountable to them; 2, The supreme government of every church by itself, to the exclusion of synods, presbyteries, conventions, and all general bodies whatever. This allows advisary councils, associations of ministers, conferences of ministers and delegates; but it does not allow the establishment of any court superior to the church, either of legislation or judicature. In earlier times this point was much insisted upon. Gibbon says, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," that independence and equality formed the basis of the internal constitution of the primitive churches in the Roman empire. The same fact is attested by Mosheim, Murdock, Neander, and all the great scholars of church history.

This was regarded, at the origin of Congregationalism, as its great distinguishing feature, and gave it the name of independency. It was the point in which its friends chiefly gloried, and against which its enemies took the strongest exceptions. It is undoubtedly in conformity with the plan of the apostles, but very unlike the plans of all the ancient traditionary churches, and most churches of modern origin. The ancients supposed it to be a defect, and resorted to superior ecclesiastical courts to remedy the supposed defect. The Episcopalians and Presbyterians still regard it as a defect, and are at great pains to remedy it in their respective systems. Many Congregationalists do not comprehend its importance, and are not aware of its relations to other parts of their system.

According to the Congregationalist theory, the church is an independent body, charged with all the powers of church sovereignty whatever. Other churches have the same power, but no church, and no body of churches, has greater powers. Each church may delegate its powers to individuals and courts; but can only delegate those which it legitimately possesses originally in itself. The powers of the church are to give law to its members conformably to the word of God, both in respect to doctrine and discipline. These members comprehend its officers, which are of the church, and not over it. The Congregational church has authority equally over its clergy and laity. Each clergyman, however, is responsible to his own church alone. At its tribunal he stands, and there alone is he liable to fall.

The plan of disciplining offending clergymen by mutual or exparte councils is no departure from this system. It is at the option of the church to try cases in Congregational church meetings, to appoint committees of its membership to try them, or to ask the aid of sister churches, by their ministers and delegates, in mutual or exparte councils. Calling mutual councils in such cases is a voluntary concession to the accused. If he concurs, it is well. It is the kindest and best arrangement, for securing the just rights of the accused, that can be conceived of.

If the accused does not concur, and will not coöperate with the church in calling a mutual council, then it is clearly the right of the church to call an exparte council. If the accused consents to the trial, and affords such facilities as he can to a fair investigation of his case, it is well. But, if he is refractory, he is in the hands of the church, and it is bound to judge him and dispose of his case according to the Scriptures and the principles of natural justice.

The council called to assist a church in disciplining its minister has all the legitimate authority in the case which the church gives it, and no more. It receives no power from the accused. Whether he consents or not, the jurisdiction of the court is the same.

Consociationalism is a corruption of Congregationalism. It constitutes permanent courts above and over the churches. Consociated churches resign their independency just to that extent to which they commit jurisdiction to the consociations.

It is supposed, however, by some, that pure Congregationalism is defective, and that consociations supply this defect. This was the plea of antiquity. Apostolic order without superior church courts is defective; we must supply the defect by provincial and general councils, with judicial and legislative power. This is the aim of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. In the opinion of those orders, the churches are not competent to take care of themselves, still less to take care of their ministers. They must have superior courts of legislation and judicature to take care of them. So say monarchists in regard to democracy in the state; the people are not competent to exercise the rights of sovereignty; they must be put under masters and tutors.

But Christ and the apostles thought otherwise, and provided no superior court above the local church. None is needed, and none can be provided without endangering the success and prosperity of the church, and, ultimately, its very existence as a church of Christ.

The objection to leaving all the higher duties of discipline to

the churches is, that they are not competent to perform them. Without counsel, they may not be; but it is in the power of the feeblest church to take the best counsel in the land; and it is, by the system of mutual and exparte councils, in the power of the accused to have the best. However incompetent churches may be, unadvised, to dispose of difficult cases of discipline, and especially those of ministers, they can do it very well with such aid. Nobody can do it better, and none can be more safely intrusted with the doing of it.

The argument for establishing courts of ecclesiastical legislation and government over churches is as indecisive in respect to the discipline of churches themselves, as it is, in respect to ministers. Churches do not require any such superior courts. This may be inferred from the fact that Christ did not establish any. But it also appears from other considerations. Such courts are inconsistent with the fundamental hypothesis of church independency and democracy. But churches may do wrong, and require discipline to bring them to their duty. This is very true. Churches may do wrong, and require discipline to bring them to their duty. So may superior superintending church courts do wrong, and require discipline to bring them to their duty; and that through all their ranks and orders. On the principle of superior courts, the superior may correct the inferior, till you get up to the supreme court. The supreme court superintends and controls all the subordinate ones. Who shall correct that? Who shall make that always do right? It governs numerous churches in which it has no direct personal interest, with which it has no intimate and exact acquaintance. It may, if misled, mislead its churches. It may mislead them all. What security have we that it will not? None at all. Such courts are far more likely to be misled than the churches are. They have not half the interest that the churches usually have, in judging correctly, in respect to the matters that come before them. Nor are they half as likely to be corrected when they have fallen into error.

The early Congregationalists in this country were exceedingly zealous on this point, and deemed it of the greatest importance, to the preservation of religion in its purity, that the most perfect independence of the churches should be maintained. But it will still be said, that the churches will often fail in the performance of their duty, and go beyond or come short of it. That may be. So will superior courts. Imperfection is incident to all human arrangements. Men cannot be perfect in any way. But, if churches may sometimes come short of their duty, and sometimes go beyond it, they will be much more likely to be corrected, and discover their mistakes in time to rectify them, than superior church courts, because they will meet the consequences of their errors face to face.

It may further be said that superior church courts are necessary to preserve the churches from relapsing into heresy. Truth must be supported by authority, and that authority must be above the church, and above its individual ministry. This is a great discovery of post-apostolic times, unknown to the apostles, and unrecognized in their institutes. They made no provision of this kind, and did not perceive the necessity of any. But the supposition is not true. Religious truth may as safely be left to its evidences as any other branch of history or philosophy. If men believe what can be proved and made clear to them, it is usually enough. False and unnecessary supports always injure a good cause. Officiousness is always offensive, often highly injurious. The churches can usually take better and safer care of their orthodoxy than superior judicatories. If they could not, we might despair. For, the plan of preserving the purity of religion by superior church courts has had the fairest trial, and has proved an entire failure. It was tried in all the ancient churches, and has failed in all.

CHAPTER XI.

CONFEDERATIONS OF CONGREGATIONALISTS.

INDEPENDENCE precludes centralization, but it does not preclude confederation for the accomplishment of objects of general interest and importance. For purposes of government, churches have no occasion to unite. Each church is as competent, with advisary councils, to attend to that matter alone, as with any number of churches. Churches have no need to confederate for the promotion of adherence to given standards of faith. If the faith cannot be preserved by free discussion, if it is not safe on the ground of its evidences, it will be hard to support it by the combined authority of confederate churches, and such faith will be worth but little when supported. And yet there are limits beyond which diversities of opinion cannot be tolerated without proving a bar to communion. Of these every church ought to judge for itself. From corrupt churches the pure may withdraw, ought to withdraw. But they need no superior courts to correct their judgments, and dictate to them on this subject. If they want advice, they may take it in private, or call councils, and obtain it publicly from them. It may be said that it is just as well, and practically better, to create superior courts to take cognizance of the conduct of ministers, and also of churches, and to keep both in the right way. This is precisely what was done by the ancient Christians, and they went on from little to little till they landed in the Patriarchal and Papal despotisms. There are two points of rest in respect to church polity: 1, That of perfect democracy and independency; 2, That of perfect hierarchical despotism, exalting the ministry to be lords, and reducing the membership to spiritual slavery. The least departure from independency is a dangerous precedent. Having taken

one step, it is impossible to stop there always. The subject must advance or recede.

The only legitimate purpose of a confederation of churches is the prosecution of objects in which different churches wish to unite, and in which they can act to better advantage together than apart. The prosecution of foreign and domestic missions, the publication of religious and denominational books, and general systems of coöperation to assist indigent young men in preparing for the ministry, and the promotion of piety generally, are objects of this kind. The Baptist associations and Congregational conferences are restricted to objects of this kind. These bodies do not meddle with church discipline. They leave that to the churches severally. But they perform important service in the cause of missions and in the promotion of other benevolent objects. A confederation of Congregational churches on the conference or convention system, which should unite Congregationalists generally for all common purposes: 1, Missionary purposes; 2, Book publication purposes; 3, Education of candidates for the ministry, would be an unspeakable benefit, and would tend more than anything else to give unity and efficiency to the whole body of Congregational churches. A national conference of this kind would be a bond of union and sympathy to the whole order, and would be a convenient organization for the promotion of all its common and national objects.

No confederation can be compulsory. But a national confederation commenced, inviting general participation for the common good, would be highly attractive, and would naturally draw in numerous adherents. If it should become universal, or nearly so, it might be the occasion of great good. It is the duty of churches, as it is of individuals, to coöperate together, for the promotion of common objects, in all cases where they can do it to advantage. They may also aid and encourage one another in various ways, and ought to do so to the greatest extent possible. A spirit of fraternal kindness and good will ought to pervade the entire body, and to be strengthened and promoted by the

utmost possible kindness and mutual well-doing on the part of the churches and membership.

If a national conference or convention was formed on the principle of representation from the district or state conferences or conventions, it would represent the spirit and principles of the churches generally, and become their natural organ for appointing missionary and other church boards, and conducting all the general operations of the churches.

The convention held at Albany, New York, October 5—8, 1852, consisted of Congregational ministers and delegates from all parts of the country, and was called by direction of the general association of New York. The object of this convention was to consider the plan of union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the building of church edifices at the west, and the system and operations of the American Home Missionary Society. The influence of the meeting was eminently beneficial, in promoting union and friendship among the different branches of the Congregational family of churches, and in different and distant sections of the country.

The conferences and discussions had at Albany in 1852 led, in March 3, 1853, to the formation of the American Congregational Union; to collect, preserve and publish authentic information concerning the history, condition, and continued progress of the Congregational churches, in all parts of the country, with their affiliated institutions, and with their relations to kindred churches and institutions in other countries; to promote by tracts and books, and by devising and recommending to the public plans of coöperation in building churches and parsonages, and in providing parochial and pastoral libraries; and to afford increased facilities for mutual acquaintance, and friendly intercourse and helpfulness among ministers and churches of the Congregational order, &c.

Its business is managed by a board of not more than thirty nor less than five trustees. Any person approving of the objects of the association may become a member for life, by paying

twenty-five dollars or a member for the year by paying one dollar.

The American Congregational Union is not an ecclesiastical body, but a voluntary society for specific purposes relating to Congregationalism. The demand for such a society is an indication favorable to the scheme of a confederation of ministers and churches, by a system of national, state and district conferences or conventions, in which all the Congregational churches of the nation may be represented. Such a convention, organized on strictly Congregational principles, to have no legislative or judicial power over the churches, but to be their organ of advice and counsel, and of mutual coöperation in the prosecution of foreign and domestic missions, and other general objects, would be an invaluable blessing.

Great Britain has the Congregational union of England and Wales. I beg leave to suggest to the Congregationalists of England and America the expediency of forming a Congregational union, or a confederation of Congregationalists, for the the world. The church of the liberties of the human race ought to be one; and there ought to be some visible symbols of union and agreement, and some stated means and occasions of mutual intercourse, counsel and coöperation. These might be furnished by a system of confederation, for mutual counsel and advice on all the great common interests of Congregational Christianity, in which the Congregationalism of the world should have an equable representation.

The attempt to unite all the heterogeneous and orthodox churches of Protestant Christendom in a world union, a few years since, has proved a disgraceful failure, as well it might. But the different branches of the great Congregational family, contending on a common platform of primitive Christianity for the liberties of the human race, may easily unite together, and strengthen and instruct each other by such a union. Such a confederation might be denominated THE WORLD'S CONGREGATIONAL CONVENTION. Shall we not have it? Can it possibly be

long deferred? We must have it, and must have it long before we can possibly have the general triumph of religion and liberty. We must have its powerful and beneficial influences to secure that triumph.

CHAPTER XI.

BAPTIST CONGREGATIONALISM.

That portion of the early Protestants that rejected infant baptism, and baptized exclusively by immersion, were originally called *Anabaptists*, from αναβαπτιστης, one that baptizes again. They claim that their sentiments were held by the Petrobrusian and Catharists. But this sect had its origin in Germany, about the year 1521, under the guidance of Thomas Munzer, Mark Stubner, Nicolas Stork and others.

1, They held to the baptism of adults by immersion; 2, A community of goods in the church; 3, Preaching, by the laity, without a professional ministry; 4, The abolition of civil government, church government superseding that of the state, and rendering it unnecessary.

Munzer, and others, having collected a large army in the rural districts of Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia and Saxony, proclaimed war, in 1525, with all civil governments, with a view to set up the church and kingdom of Christ as supreme and alone. They were totally defeated in an obstinate battle, May 15, 1525, and from five thousand to seven thousand killed. Munzer, and other leaders, were beheaded with circumstances of the greatest ignominy and cruelty, and the insurrection suppressed. This sect rallied again after the defeat of 1525, under John Bockold, of Leyden, and others, and gained many adherents. The principal theatre of its operations was at Munster. John Bockold, of Leyden, called John of Leyden, assumed the title of King of Zion, and appointed twelve judges to assist him in administering the government of his kingdom.

He took several wives, and commenced living in princely luxury and magnificence. The excesses in which the King of Zion and his adherents indulged almost exceeded belief. Their blind and furious fanaticism followed them even to the scaffold, where they appeared, in some cases, more like maniacs than like reasonable beings; and I think it cannot be doubted that several of their prominent members became the subjects of real mania. The city of Munster, the stronghold of the Anabaptists, was taken by its temporal sovereign in 1536, after an obstinate resistance, the kingdom of the Anabaptists destroyed, and the King of Zion, with two of his most active supporters, put to death with torture.

Some twenty-six apostles survived, who had been sent out by Bockold to extend his kingdom in other parts of Europe; and many other teachers continued to promulgate the Anabaptist sentiments. The Anabaptists, from the beginning, had claimed a superior dispensation of the Holy Spirit, with supernatural dreams and visions. These were continued after the fall of Munster, the same as before. Different sections of them bore different names, taken from their leaders. They suffered much by persecution, and many were cruelly put to death.

More than fifty thousand persons are supposed to have perished in this movement.

They now rejected polygamy, and several other vices of their original organization, and began to assume the form and order of a reasonable Christian sect. This change was brought about, to a great extent, by Menno, a distinguished reformer and leader among them.

Menno was born in Friesland, in 1505. Being at first a Catholic priest, he was led by reading the Bible to renounce Catholicism, and to embrace the doctrine of the Anabaptists respecting baptism, without adopting much of their fanaticism.

After the disaster at Munster, he became a prominent teacher and preacher in this sect, and contributed much to recall his

brethren to reason and sobriety. Menno adopted the general system of the other Protestants in respect to Christian doctrines, but more especially that of Calvin; and his church polity was a modification of Presbyterianism.

The Anabaptists are still reckoned among the minor sects of Germany and Holland. In the latter country they first obtained complete religious liberty in 1626. A majority of the Dutch Anabaptists are Arminians; others are strict Calvinists. Anabaptist churches are found on the banks of the Rhine, in Prussia, Switzerland, and several of the German states.

All the Anabaptists have ministers or elders who preside in church-sessions, teachers who preach and exhort, but do not administer the sacraments, and deacons.

The session consists of three orders: the elder, preacher, or exhorter, and deacons. The elders and exhorters are ordained by the imposition of hands. All are chosen by the votes of the brethren, and the weightier matters are decided in church meetings. The church meeting is the supreme church court; so that the Anabaptist system of church polity is a modification of Congregationalism by Presbyterianism, or perhaps rather of Presbyterianism by Congregationalism. The Congregational element is the predominant one.

The Anabaptists endeavored to establish themselves in England, directly after the origin of that sect in Germany and Holland; but with little success.

The Baptists of England are of two kinds, General and Particular. The General Baptists are Arminians, and maintain open communion; the Particular Baptists are Calvinists, and maintain close communion.

The father of the General Baptists in England was Rev. John Smyth, fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, a popular preacher, and a great sufferer for nonconformity. Separating from the church of England, he first joined the Congregationalists, became one of their leading men in 1592, and was imprisoned under Elizabeth. He fled, with the other Congregationalists, to Hol-

land, to escape persecution, and joined an English Congregational church at Amsterdam, in 1606. Here he adopted Baptist and Arminian opinions, withdrew, with his adherents, from the Congregational order, and commenced the order of General Baptists. He removed, with his church, to Leyden, where he died in 1610. After his death his church returned to England, and propagated their faith and order in that country. But they did not attract very general attention.

The Particular Baptists trace their origin to a Congregational church, from which they withdrew, and formed a separate establishment, in London, in 1616. The Baptist secession had letters of dismission from the Congregational church, to which they previously belonged, and formed their first Baptist church under Rev. John Spilsbury, in 1633, under Charles I.

They received an addition from the same church in 1638, and the next year, 1639, they formed a second Baptist church. After this their churches multiplied rapidly. They published a confession of faith in 1646, which was subsequently revised and reäffirmed in 1689, by a convention of ministers and delegates from more than one hundred churches in England and Wales.

Roger Williams founded the first Baptist church in America, in Rhode Island, in 1636, the same year that the second church of the Particular Baptist order was founded in London, and three years after the origin of the order, in 1633. Roger Williams was a native of Wales. He was educated at the university of Oxford, and admitted to holy orders in the church of England, of which he was some time a minister. Having rendered himself obnoxious to the laws against nonconformists, he emigrated to America in 1631. In April following he was called to be teaching elder in the church in Salem, under Mr. Skelton as pastor. This giving offence to the governor, he went to Plymouth and engaged as assistant to Mr. Ralph Smith, pastor of that church. After having labored here a while, he returned to Salem, and, at the death of Mr Skelton, succeeded him in the pastorate of the church of Salem, in 1634. He was accounted a pious and godly man, but

his opinions were considered extreme. He preached against the right of the king to dispose of the lands of the Indians by patent; against admitting men that were not pious to holy ordinances; and denied the right of the state to take cognizance of sins pertaining to the first table of the law, or to deal in matters of conscience and religion.

In consequence of his public preaching and advocacy of these opinions, he incurred the displeasure of the colonial government, and, in 1635, was banished from the colony of Massachusetts Bay. He did not immediately leave, on account of a strong party in his favor. To avoid, however, being arrested and sent back to England, he fled the January following; first to Rehoboth, in Plymouth colony, then to a place beyond the bounds of Plymouth colony, which he named *Providence*, where he laid the foundation of the city by that name, and of the State of Rhode Island, in 1636.

He afterwards embraced the Baptist doctrines respecting baptism, and was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, whom he afterwards baptized in the same manner. He also organized a Baptist church. Subsequently he retired from the ministry, and doubted the validity of all baptism, for want of a direct succession of duly baptized baptizers to the apostles. The settlement became a flourishing colony, of which he was several times president. He was the author of several able controversial works, in favor of his theological and political views, and against those of his adversaries; and died at Providence, in 1683, after a life of great industry and enterprise, and also of great usefulness.

The Baptist denomination, both in England and America, broke off from the Congregationalists, and is a part of the General Congregational body. They are strictly a subdivision of the Congregationalists. This denomination has become one of the principal denominations of the United States, and is of several orders. The principal of these are, 1, The Regular Baptists; 2, The Freewill Baptists; 3, The Campbellite Baptists; and 4, The Sabbatarians or Saturday-keeping Baptists.

Of these the Regular Baptists are most numerous, the Campbellites next, the Freewill Baptists next, and the Sabbatarians least.

The Regular Baptists are Calvinists and close communionists; the Freewill Baptists, Arminians and open communionists; the Campbellite Baptists regard baptism as a saving ordinance, and adopt the Arminian theology; and the Sabbatarians keep Saturday as the Sabbath, instead of the first day of the week.

The entire Baptist denomination, at the last census of the United States, in 1850, is reported as follows:

Number of church edifices, ...	8,791
Aggregate accommodations, ...	3,130,878

John Bunyan was a Baptist clergyman in Bedfordshire, England. Cromwell, during the time of his ascendency, dismissed his Baptist officers from the army, but allowed free toleration to this order, and his *tryers* admitted a number of Baptist preachers to become parish ministers. On the restoration of Charles II., the Baptists suffered with the other nonconformists; but were relieved, with the rest, in 1688, when free toleration was obtained. Among their most eminent men are Robert Hall, Andrew Fuller, John Bunyan and John Foster.

In 1850 the Regular Baptists had

Ministers, ...	5,142
Members, ...	686,807
Churches, ...	8,406

They have missionary and religious publication boards, and expend annually in the cause of foreign missions more than a hundred thousand dollars.

In the United States the Baptists are numerous at the west and south, and are rapidly increasing. They were not originally distinguished as champions of education, but have latterly founded numerous institutions of academic and collegiate learning, and have several theological institutions.

Their government is strictly democratic. Licenses to preach are given by the churches, and not by the associations, as among

the Congregationalists; and all the powers of church sovereignty are exercised by the brethren. Their difference from other Congregationalists relates to baptism alone, and things growing out of their peculiar doctrines with relation to this rite.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROSPECTS OF CONGREGATIONALISM.

We have seen the origin of Congregationalism in England, under Robert Brown, in 1581, and followed it in its rapid growth and effective influence, till in the time of the Westminster Assembly and of Cromwell, in 1643—1660, it became one of the great controlling agencies of the world, accomplishing little and attempting little by direct church authority, but by general and moral influences accomplishing much.

Within seventy years from its origin it becomes one of the great revolutionary elements of the British empire, and materially effects the general course of the world's affairs. But on that vast arena, and mingled with the various conflicting elements that met and coöperated there, it was cast down, and, for a time, covered with dishonor and reproach.

But, after the lapse of twenty years, it revives again, and has held on its way till now, one of the most resolute, consistent, determined and practically useful of the independent religious bodies in Great Britain. It is a growing body, and is growing in wisdom and in respectability and influence, even more than in numbers. Its foreign missionaries from England and Wales are in China, India, Africa, the West Indies, and in several other parts of the world, laboring successfully for the promulgation of the Christian faith, and extending both their order and the

kingdom of Christ through the world. This church gives the first great impulse to republican principles in England, produces some of the most illustrious lights of the world, among which is the divine Milton, and, up to the present time, has been the uncompromising and staunch defender of civil and religious liberty, and the loud and earnest pleader for the practical equality and brotherhood of the human race.

Persecuted and oppressed in Great Britain, it comes to these then wild and barren shores, unfolds here the standard of Christ and of civil and religious liberty, and lays the foundation of the noblest Christian empire that the world has yet seen. Under its mighty and benignant influence, the wilderness of New England was made, in a few years, to bud and blossom as the rose, and to become like the garden of God. Its people raised themselves to that dignity and sublimity of character that they dared to resist the oppressions of England in all their incipient stages; and, finally, to unite with their fellow-citizens of the other colonies, to disengage themselves from the British empire, and establish their national independence by the force of arms. None but the most resolute or the most imprudent of men would have dared to venture on so bold, so perilous an experiment. None but the most generous would have put so much to hazard, for so little benefit to themselves, personally, though so great a benefit for future ages and distant nations.

New England Congregationalism was the school of New England patriotism and republicanism. It was the nursery of those private and public virtues that qualified New England to perform the honorable part which devolved upon her, in the great revolutionary conflict. The same polity in the Baptist churches of the south was, with Jefferson and others, the model of the American republic. In the minds of the New England Congregationalists, democracy in the church had always suggested a corresponding democracy in the state.

The first cloud of the revolutionary war rose over New England. There the conflict began, and there first, the capacity of the

Americans to contend with the disciplined soldiery of England, in behalf of the holy cause of liberty, had to be tested. If New England had proved unequal to the conflict, in the first shock of arms, the whole country would have recoiled in discouragement, and all hope of liberty would have been lost. But God's grace was sufficient for his people in their time of need, and his people were equal to the emergency which they were called to meet. Lexington and Bunker Hill, which tried men's souls, found the New Englanders competent to sustain themselves on the high ground they had taken, and able to contend successfully against the veteran soldiers of Europe.

It is not claimed for the Congregational Puritans that they alone had the virtue and intelligence to meet the great crisis of those times. But it is claimed that the part that New England acted in those events was a leading and controlling part; one that turned the scale in favor of liberty; and that, if it had been far less decided and magnanimous, would have rendered the establishment of our independence and of republicanism impossible.

The first great service of Congregationalism in this country was giving us our revolutionary principles and spirit, and the courage and determination, having undertaken the conflict for liberty, to fight it through. Its second benefit is giving us our republican government. We might have had our national independence, and have been under a hereditary monarchy and aristocracy. How much better to be under a republic! For this blessing, and the attendant and consequent benefits it may confer, we are indebted to Congregationalism. Episcopacy could not have given it; Presbyterianism could not have given it. Congregationalism did give it, and is the only church polity that could have given it. A third blessing of Congregationalism is its effect in promoting general intelligence, piety, and virtue; and thus laying a foundation, in the character of the people, for the stability and permanence of the government, and the indefinite improvement of our social and political institutions.

The cause of the liberty of the human race is bound up in the same bundle with republican Christianity. Let republicanism prevail in the church, and be extended through the world, and it will pass from the church to the state, and prevail there. Universal republicanism in the church would lead, in its ultimate result, to universal republicanism in the state. Nor can that result be attained by any other method. Republicanism came first in the church in this country, and was propagated thence to the state. There is no other so effectual method of its propagation.

It is thought by many to be of little consequence what the plan of church organization and government is, provided there is a wise and faithful administration. But it is of some consequence to have the best plan. An organization on the best plan, in the same hands, may be of vastly greater use than an inferior organization. In the complicated struggles and manifold temptations and difficulties of life, we want every advantage we can possibly have. The church wants the same. If Congregationalism is any better than other polities, the church wants it.

The Congregationalist scheme of church organization consults for the greatest possible exaltation of the church. As it commits everything to the hands and care of the membership, so it demands of the membership a corresponding degree of intelligence and public virtue. Nor does it demand this in vain. It secures it; and is able to do it generally.

Congregationalism began its career in this country in 1620. In 1776 it led to the declaration of our national independence; then to our republican government; and, later still, to all our prosperity and happiness. Two hundred and thirty-four years have passed, and behold what hath the Lord wrought by this mighty agency! We have twenty-five millions of people, most of whom are enjoying the blessings of civil and religious liberty to an extent unprecedented and unequalled in any past age, or any other part of the globe. And the great blot on our national honor, from the existence of slavery, is not the fault of Congre-

gationalism, but of other despotic organizations of the church, which are less able to cope with organic vices and sins.

Slaveholding derives very little support from Congregationalism. That system of government in the church is not in its favor, but against it. The systems which are principally enlisted in its support, and which are depended upon to keep it in credit, are the Papal, Episcopal, and Presbyterian systems. The Quakers, who first prohibited slaveholding in their connection, are church republicans and independents. Had they not been, they never could have carried this measure. Neither of the two great schools of Presbyterians are able to prohibit slaveholding to their members; notwithstanding that a large proportion, perhaps a numerical majority, of their members, would be glad to do so.

No other church can begin to claim that relation to the great liberal movements of the age which belongs, unquestionably, to church democracy. And this democracy has but begun its career; it has but started in its race. It has not yet perfected its own institutions, or settled down on its ultimate methods of prosecuting the great ends and purposes of its existence. If it has been able to act the Hercules in its cradle, and to strangle the malignant serpent of despotism in its infancy, how much more will its full maturity be characterized by Herculean labors of beneficence and love! God has put peculiar honor on the infancy of Congregationalism, both in Europe and America. He has acknowledged it as one of the great instruments of his providence, to revolutionize the condition of the human race, and to subvert the thrones of despotism.

Had not a false and deceitful liberality diverted Congregationalists from a just and proper support and dissemination of the principles of their order in America, they would at this moment have been much more numerous and influential than they now are, and their country and the fortunes of the human race have been proportionably more advanced. A considerable part of the domain of Presbyterianism in America should have been

claimed and secured for Congregationalism. It was due to scriptural truth, and national liberty, to have instituted such claims, and prosecuted them to success. But, though much has been lost by inaction and an erroneous policy of false liberality, much unoccupied territory is yet to be possessed; and, with reasonable zeal and industry, some of the losses of past years of indifferentism, may be recovered.

The *Edinburgh Witness* publishes the following speculations on the prospects of Presbyterianism, from the pen of Hugh Miller, one of the most powerful and sagacious reasoners of the day:

"The time appears to be come when we may safely hazard a guess as to the form of church government which is destined to prevail ultimately over the earth. Of the three leading forms which divide Christendom, — the Popish, the Episcopal, and the Presbyterian, — the last bids fairest at this hour to gain the mastery. We treat the subject altogether irrespective of any auguries which may be drawn from the claim of divine right which may be urged in behalf of any or of all these forms. For the sake of argument, we place them all on a level in this respect, and we look simply at the past progress and the present position of these three rival systems. The past century and a half has effected a prodigious change in their relative position. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Popish form was rapidly recovering the ground it had lost at the period of the reformation. The injuries which Luther had inflicted upon it in the sixteenth century were compensated, or in a fair way of being so, by the victories of the Jesuits in the seventeenth; and the states which had revolted at the former era were now, one after one, bowing the neck and receiving the yoke of their former ruler. Episcopacy, too, was looking up. The established form in England, it seemed almost certain that its fortunes would keep pace with those of the kingdom to which it was linked, and that it would grow and flourish wherever the British power took root.

"It was different with Presbyterianism. Its day was over, and there seemed before it a rapid decadence and inevitable extinction. It had culminated in the early part of the seventeenth century; and the eighteenth, it would have been held, would see its sun go down forever. It lingered nowhere but amongst a few feeble communities. In Geneva it still displayed its standard, but with an arm deeply palsied with Pelagian errors. In Holland it was all but stifled with the thick fogs of Arminianism. It had been chased from France by the infatuated bigotry and tyranny of Louis XIV. In Scotland it had been bound with the band of patronage, and left to die on those very mountains where it had bravely contended at the close of the previous century. Thus everywhere the tide of Presbyterianism was ebbing. Yet even then the current had begun to turn, and from the middle of the eighteenth century what a different history has been that of the three forms of church government! Of too subtle a character, and too far down for the eye of man to detect, principles were even then at work all over Christendom, undermining the power of an apparently living and growing Romanism, and imbuing with fresh vitality an apparently palsied and dying Presbyterianism. Future defeats for the former, and future victories for the latter, were preparing unseen. But unseen these agencies did not long remain. They stept forth from the darkness of their inchoation, and demonstrated their power by the different fate which they henceforward impressed upon the great religious systems of Europe. The progress of Romanism was instantly arrested, and the labors of the Jesuits were swept away, well-nigh altogether, in a single year, by the terrible force of a revolution sprung of infidelity. Episcopacy, confined in its palmiest days to the soil of England, has since been unable to enlarge its territory to any very considerable extent. Presbyterianism all the while has made progress! While Romanism covers only its old ground, and that ground frightfully undermined; while Episcopacy has been able to throw out only comparatively feeble shoots, Pres-

byterianism has been extending itself on the right hand and on the left. It has crossed the ocean, and gone to the end of the earth to find new seats and possess new hemispheres; and, with that daring which conscious might and a firm faith in its future dominion only would give, it has seized on new worlds, and is planting them with cities and nations.

"Not only has Presbyterianism revived in its old homes in Europe, but the great American nation is leavened with it. This alone is almost decisive of the future fate of that form of church government. Episcopacy, no doubt, has migrated to the British colonies, but, like certain other emigrants, with the help of the state bounty. Presbyterianism has gone forth of itself. The Episcopal communions with which our colonies are dotted remind us of transplanted trees, stunted in their growth and sickly in their vegetation. The Presbyterian churches which cover the United States, and the Presbyterian communities which are now laying their foundations in the southern hemisphere, remind us of those seeds which, wafted by the winds and watered by the rains, are destined to grow up, with no culture but that of nature, into hardy and flourishing forests. If Presbyterianism shall grow as prodigiously during the coming as during the past hundred years, it will have attained dimensions so imposing, both in respect of power and of extent of territory, that all other systems will appear diminutive in its presence. Some curious light has recently been thrown upon the subject of church government, by the discovery of ancient manuscripts. 'Hippolytus and his Age,' a recently discovered treatise of the third century, represents its author as protesting against the attempted usurpations of incipient prelacy, and as asserting the apostolicity of Presbyterianism. Hippolytus appears to have flourished about the year 225; he was a member of the presbytery of Rome, and exercised the pastorate within a few miles of that city. Chevalier Bunsen, no friend to the presbyterian polity, makes the important admission, when expounding the views of this author, that 'his ecclesiastical polity may be termed Pres-

byterianism.' May not the last days of the church be like her first? and may not that system which governed her infancy and youth, serve to enlighten her noon?"

It is not very strange that a Scotch Presbyterian, indifferently acquainted with the under currents of church history, and with the precise state of ecclesiastical matters in America, should indulge in this happy augury for Presbyterianism. It is scarcely to be wondered at, that, in taking account of the great spiritual powers of the world, only the Papal, Episcopal and Presbyterian, should attract his notice at all. But the younger son has sometimes outstripped the elder in the race of prosperity, and taken precedence of him in rank and power. It was so in the families of Jacob and of Jesse. When Samuel inspected the seven sons of Jesse, to distinguish the Lord's anointed, he looked on Eliab, and said surely this is he. But God said, No. The rest all passed under his searching gaze, but the chosen one did not appear. At last, David, unthought of as a candidate for such distinguished honors, was called in, and the Lord said, Arise and anoint him, for this is he. — 1 Sam. 16: 6—13.

The elder claimant of ultimate universal empire is the Papal church. She has been in earnest pursuit of this object more than a thousand years; but is getting farther and farther from it, all the while. She can never get it. The next claimant is the collective Episcopacy; but the prospects of Episcopalianism are by no means flattering. The third claimant is Presbyterianism. Last of all comes up the youngest son of the reformation, Congregationalism; and already God seems to say, by his providence, and by the blessings of his grace conferred, "Arise, anoint him, for this is he."

Presbyterianism cannot fight the battle of liberty for the human race. Congregationalism can. The supposed superiority of Presbyterianism to Congregationalism in America is owing to a pernicious error in the policy of the latter denomination, that is being corrected; and, besides, it is more apparent than

real. The Congregationalist element of the United States is at this moment superior to Presbyterianism in effective influence, and probably in numbers. It is also spreading with unexampled rapidity. It embraces, besides the Congregationalists, usually so called, the great denominations of Baptists and Christians, together with the Unitarians, and several smaller sects; and is advancing throughout the entire land with giant strides.

The post-apostolic church in the times of Hippolytus was only Presbyterian as Presbyterianism is a modification of Episcopacy, and proves nothing in favor of the apostolic authority of Presbyterianism, or any other modification of despotism. But, leaving Hugh Miller with his dream of the coming glories and triumphs of Presbyterianism, how justly may we anticipate the rapid restoration of the church to its apostolic model of thorough democracy, and then its increasing enlargement, usefulness and prosperity, till it shall fill the world, and all nations rejoice in its healing and healthful fruits, and refreshing shade.

Congregationalism has been in America, more than any other order, the champion of the general education of the people. The American system of common schools is one of its trophies. Its colleges and seminaries of theological learning are the most distinguished in the land. Its contributions to the cause of foreign and domestic missions are on a scale of princely munificence, and are operarting powerfully to Christianize and Congregationalize the world.

The friends of Congregationalism never had such encouragement to perfect their methods, and labor for the diffusion of their principles, as at the present moment. The experiments of two hundred and sixty-nine years, since Congregationalism was first proposed, have contributed to demonstrate most fully the inability of all other systems to meet the necessities of society, and the ability of Congregationalism to meet them fully. The system was first proposed as the system of the New Testament, and of primitive Christianity, entitled to the highest confidence

from its divine origin. It now stands before the world as a tried system, capable of meeting the great exigences of the times, in church and state, to a much greater extent than the other and rival systems that are in the field with it.

DIVISION VII.

MINOR DENOMINATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE UNITED BRETHREN OR MORAVIANS AND QUAKERS.

1. *The United Brethren.*

THE United Brethren had their origin in the colony of Herrnhut, in Lusatia, Saxony, under the patronage of Count Zinzendorf, a pious and wealthy nobleman of that country, in A. D. 1727. They are called Moravians, because, in the original organization of the church, the religious views and usages of the more ancient Moravian Christians were extensively adopted. For the same reason this order has generally been considered as a modification of the more ancient order of the Bohemian brethren, which owed its origin to John Huss, in A. D. 1413.

Count Zinzendorf established his colony as an asylum for the persecuted Protestants of Moravia and Bohemia. After considerable numbers had been attracted to his settlement, he constituted them into a religious community, under the title of the United Brethren; and designed his organization to be a kind of *union church*, in which the Bohemian and Moravian Episcopalians, German Reformed Presbyterians, and the Lutherans, might all unite. Hence its name *United Brethren;* implying a

union of the friends of different systems of church polity. They at first adopted the common-stock principle in respect to property; but, not finding it to work according to their expectations, they have generally abandoned it. They adopt no specific articles of faith, and require no subscriptions to such articles by their ministry or membership; but concur in the general confessions adopted by the leading denominations of Protestant Christendom, and especially in that of the Lutherans, adopted at Augsburg. The actual faith of the United Brethren is nearly the same as that of the Methodists.

The United Brethren have four orders of church officers: 1, Bishops; 2, Elders; 3, Deacons; 4, Lay Elders.

1. The bishops derive their ordination and authority from the Protestant bishops of the Bohemian brethren, and the first of this succession was ordained by a Waldensian bishop. The bishops have exclusive authority to administer ordination, but have no direct government of the church. 2. The elders are the stated ministers of single communities. 3. The deacons are the lowest order of ministers, but have full authority to preach and administer the sacraments. Candidates for higher orders are first made deacons, as among the Episcopalians and Methodists. 4. Lay elders have the charge of divisions and portions of single churches, and are the assistants of the preaching elders in the pastoral charge.

The United Brethren have a general board of directors at Herrnhut, in Saxony, which has the supreme government and superintendence of the order. They also have national boards in England and the United States, subordinate to the general one, which manage the concerns of the order in those countries, subject to the authority of the general board.

The supreme church court is a synod, which meets once in a series of years, and appoints the general board of direction. The synods consist of one or more delegates from all the churches in the connection, together with the bishops, elders who have pastoral charges, lay elders and such other ministers

as may have been designated by the call. The synod is called by the board of directors, holding its appointment from the previous synod. The board of directors is denominated the elders' conference, and has the supreme direction of affairs in the intervals of the synods.

The government of single churches is administered by the elders' conference of the congregation, which is a local church court, consisting of the following persons. 1, The minister, as moderator; 2, The congregation-helper, where that officer exists, as in the larger churches; 3, The warden; 4, The married assistants, having care of the married people; 5, Female elders.

The missionary operations of the United Brethren have been prosecuted with great vigor and success. They have several excellent academic schools, and a few institutions of higher learning. This body is characterized by great charity, liberality, and missionary zeal, and has been one of the great lights of modern times. Its missionaries are found in almost every country and clime, from the bleak, inhospitable shores of Greenland and Labrador, to the West India islands, the coasts of Africa, and southern Asia. Their name is identified with the progress of civilization in the most desolate and uninviting portions of the world, and among the most oppressed and degraded conditions of humanity.

Several considerable branches of Christendom have been formed from the Methodists, both in England and America, who adopt the essential principles of Congregationalism; among which the Protestant Methodists hold a distinguished place.

2. *The Quakers.*

The Quakers are small among the thousands and ten thousands of Israel; but they have done good service in their day, both in the cause of religion, properly so called, and of a pure and elevated Christian morality. This body arose in England in 1647, during the time of the Westminster Assembly, and of the Commonwealth, and recognizes as its founder the celebrated

George Fox. Fox was a genuine Christian and philanthropist, but drank somewhat deeply into the enthusiasm and superstition of those times. He was the great minister of the inner light, the light of God in the soul; and insisted, with great earnestness and force, on the dispensation of the Holy Spirit as the great distinctive power and glory of Christianity. He inculcated, with great force, the doctrines of love and mutual good will; and so prominent did he make this feature of his religious and moral system, that his society was distinguished by the honorable name of Friends. He was joined by William Penn and others, and his opinions attracted general attention in England and America. He discarded nearly all forms and ceremonies, and insisted mainly on the spirit and power of religion in the soul. This he proposed to secure by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and by direct communion with God in religious contemplation and silent worship, joined with an attendance on public preaching and prayer.

Like other religious innovators, the Quakers were persecuted as troublers of the state, and disturbers of the public peace; and subjected to frequent imprisonments and other penalties. They endured their persecutions with unprecedented patience and cheerfulness, and gradually disarmed their persecutors. In carrying out the doctrine of love and mutual good will, they committed the natural and amiable mistake of pressing the scriptural injunctions against revenge and retaliation to an extreme, and adopted the non-resistance principle in respect to war and all personal violence. They also carried out the same literal interpretation in respect to the scripture prohibition of oaths, and regarded all swearing as forbidden by the word of God.

The society was organized as a radical democracy, and has been a powerful champion of the cause of civil and religious liberty. It was brought to America by William Penn, and planted in Philadelphia, at the founding of that city, in 1682. Its kind and Christian maxims, and its honesty, industry and humility, gave its subjects great advantages in their early settlement in the

country, and secured to them a high degree of peace and prosperity. The Quakers performed great services in the cause of the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in England; and this church has taken the lead of all others in the United States, in opposing the enormous wickedness of slavery, and prohibiting slaveholding to its membership. The order was divided, some years since, by Unitarianism, and resolved into two branches, the Orthodox and Unitarian.

One of its peculiarities has been an opposition to all gaudy and superfluous ornament in dress, and the adoption, to some extent, of a Christian uniform. It has also thought little of the fine arts, and borne a strong and decided testimony against the vanities of the world. In its opposition to these, it has, in some cases, gone to the opposite extreme of rejecting some things that are better retained.

Without a professional ministry, and with several things in its doctrines and policy pushed to the extreme of manifest error and absurdity, this denomination has, for some years, been on the decline. It deserves, however, well of the world, and well of this country; and will be remembered, in future times, as one of the great instruments of Providence, for the time, for the restoration of religion to its primeval purity and power, and the regeneration of society. It has about one hundred and fifty thousand communicants, mostly in Great Britain and the United States.

CHAPTER II.

THE UNITARIANS AND CHRISTIANS.

1. *The Unitarians.*

THE character of Christ early became an object of earnest investigation and inquiry in the Christian church. Arius has generally been regarded as the great heresiarch of ancient times. He was a presbyter of Alexandria, and, about the year 318, dissented from the common doctrine of the supreme divinity of Christ, and taught that he was a creature, though the most noble and exalted of all the creatures of God, and preëminently the image of his Maker, and the son of his bosom. His opinions were condemned by the council of Alexandria in 320, and by that of Nice in 325, and both he and his followers subjected to severe trials and persecutions. Though condemned and banished, he found means to promulgate his doctrines still, and gained many powerful adherents. Among others, Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor, was favorable to his views, and desired them to be tolerated. But toleration was not the order of the day. The doctrine of Christian love and the rights of human nature were not yet understood. Arius died suddenly, in 336, some supposed by divine judgment, when he was being restored to the Catholic communion. After his death, his party received great accessions, and the emperor Constantine received baptism from an Arian bishop a short time before his death.

The Arian controversy was continued, with various fortunes, for three hundred years, one party sometimes gaining the ascendency, and sometimes the other; but the Catholic party generally having the advantage, on the whole, when it was terminated by

the complete ascendency of the Catholics, in 662. From this time the controversy concerning the character of Christ was considered as settled, and permitted to rest for nearly a thousand years, till it was revived by Laelius Socinus and his followers, in 1539. The opposers of the orthodox doctrines respecting the divinity of Christ, in the sixteenth century, were called, after their distinguished leader, Socinians. They encountered violent persecution, and furnished distinguished martyrs and confessors. They became numerous, however, in Poland, and in several other parts of Europe, and their connection is still one of the four great connections recognized by the Austrian government in Transylvania, where their government is the consistorial. The Socinians agreed in rejecting the doctrine of the supreme divinity of Christ, but they did not agree with respect to his character. Some adopted the Arian doctrine of a nature far superior to that of man or angel; and others supposed him to be only man, but largely endowed and inspired by the Holy Spirit with the love, knowledge and power of God. Considerable diversities of this kind had existed among the Arians of 320—660, and had been a principal cause of their defeat in the long contest which they maintained with the Catholics, and of their decline. Besides the Socinian churches, the Socinian doctrines found their way into the Presbyterian churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, England and Ireland, and to some extent, into the church of England, and the other great churches of the reformation.

Grotius, LeClerc and Wetstein, in Holland, and Whiston, Samuel Clarke, Lardner, Locke, Newton and Milton, in England, are all reckoned among the rejecters of the supreme divinity of Christ. A list of more illustrious names, and more eminent Christians, could hardly be found. In process of time, the title of Socinians was gradually abandoned, as an appellation of the rejecters of the divinity of Christ, and that of Unitarians adopted in its place.

Latterly the prevalence of Unitarianism has considerably de-

clined in the church of England, but in the Presbyterian churches of England, Wales and Ireland, and in those of Switzerland, France and Holland, it is extensively prevalent.

Unitarianism was introduced into New England as early as 1756, and began to find disciples and advocates among the New England Congregationalists. Emelyn's Inquiry, propagating Unitarian views, was favored by Doctor Mayhew, pastor of the West church in Boston, in that year.

One of the three Episcopal churches of that city went over *en masse* to Unitarian views in 1785, and in 1805 a distinguished Unitarian was appointed to the professorship of divinity in Harvard College. The Congregational churches, however, did not divide on the subject, or prohibit Unitarian views to their membership, till 1816. They then divided, and the Orthodox Congregationalists, after much debate, withdrew from all fellowship with Unitarianism, and denounced it as, in their opinion, a fundamental departure from the doctrine of the Scriptures, not to be tolerated in the Christian church. Many were opposed to this policy at the time, both as unscriptural and inexpedient; but the exclusionists generally prevailed. The number of Unitarians in the United States is estimated at thirty thousand, with two hundred and forty-five churches, and two hundred and fifty ministers.

This denomination, as heretofore, is characterized by great diversity of faith, and of religious character. Some approximate as nearly as possible to the Orthodox creed, admitting Christ to be almost divine, like the elder Arians; others regard him as a man. Latterly a large portion of this order is believed to incline strongly to the Orthodox faith; and many of their prominent clergymen have always inculcated the duties of practical religion with great earnestness and ability. The government of the Unitarian churches in America is generally Congregational.

The Christians.

The Christians originated with the Episcopal Methodists, in Virginia and the Carolinas, in 1793, under the title of Republican Methodists. Persons from other denominations joining them, they abandoned the name of Methodists, and assumed that of Christians, as the scriptural and proper name of all the followers of Christ. They repudiate extended creeds, and admit members on a general profession of faith in Christianity. Their church officers are ministers and deacons; their church government is Congregational; and their highest judicatory, a church meeting, in which the pastor presides. The churches and ministers usually meet in conferences, though they are not obliged to do so. The conferences consist of: 1. The ministers or elders, who administer the ordinances of the church. 2. Licentiates, who are authorized to preach, but do not administer the sacraments. 3. Delegates from the churches in the state, of one for every twenty-five members. Licenses to preach are given by churches, but conferences admit licentiates to their connection at their discretion.

The conferences hold general conventions to consider the general interests of their churches. They have several institutions of learning, several periodicals, and a denominational book concern.

They have six hundred and seven churches, four hundred and ninety-two clergymen, and thirty-three thousand and forty communicants.

CHAPTER III.

THE SWEDENBORGIANS, AND LATTER-DAY SAINTS.

1. *The Swedenborgians.*

THE church of the Swedenborgians was formed by the followers of Emmanuel Swedenborg. Swedenborg was born at Stockholm, 1688, and was the son of a Lutheran bishop, by whom he was educated in the doctrines and practices of the Lutheran body. He received a liberal education in his own country, and then travelled extensively, in pursuit of knowledge, through other countries of Europe. He devoted much attention to the natural sciences, and wrote an elaborate work on them. He also published treatises on several other subjects, which attracted the attention of the government, and, with his other services, procured his elevation to the Swedish nobility, in 1719, aged thirty-one.

He first entered on his supposed intercourse with the spiritual world in A. D. 1743, aged fifty-five. At this time, he says, the eyes of his inward man were opened to see heaven, hell, and the spiritual world, in which he conversed, not only with his deceased friends and acquaintances, but with the most distinguished personages of ancient times. In 1747, at the age of fifty-nine, he resigned an office which he had long held in the mining college of Sweden, and devoted himself to his supposed divinely-appointed religious mission, of mediating between the visible world and the world of spirits.

The king of Sweden continued him his full salary as a pension. From this time he resided alternately in Sweden and in England. He wrote voluminously, and printed his theological works at his own expense. In private life he was an example of gen-

uine refinement. His conversation was instructive and agreeable. He esteemed the company of intellectual ladies, but was never married. He studiously avoided eccentricity; and in those trances during which he supposed that he conversed with spirits, and witnessed the mysterious objects of the spiritual world, his appearance and features corresponded with that supposition, expressing the most intense pain, and the most exalted pleasure, according to the nature of the objects that came within his view.

He died of apoplexy, in London, March 29, 1772, aged eighty-four; and, to the day of his death, seemed to be fully persuaded of the reality of his supposed spiritual communications. His visions of spiritual beings, and his supposed intercourse with them, are to be reckoned among the most surprising phenomena of the human mind, and deserve to be well considered in their relation to mental philosophy. They belong to the same class of experiences as trances and somnambulism, and are to be accounted for on the same principles. They unfold certain strange and mysterious capabilities of human nature, that have not yet received the attention which they deserve, and the perfect solution of which, is yet a desideratum in mental philosophy.

Swedenborg taught that the last judgment took place in the spiritual world in 1757; from which time he dates the second advent of the Lord, and the commencement of a new Christian church, which he supposed to be denoted by the New Jerusalem seen by John, in the Apocalypse, 21 : 2. He had become a member of the Lutheran church in early life, and continued in that connection till his death. He gained several adherents among his countrymen in the Lutheran church, and several in the church of England; but his followers did not form an independent church establishment till A. D. 1783, twelve years after his death. The next year, A. D. 1784, Swedenborgianism began to be preached in the United States, in Philadelphia, and other large cities; but no societies were formed in this country till ten years later, when Rev. William Hill, from England, preached extensively on the subject, and gained numerous converts.

The Swedenborgians understand the Bible as having three distinct and independent senses: 1, The natural; 2, The spiritual; 3, The celestial. This system of spiritual allegoric interpretation was early received into the post-apostolical churches, and was carried to an extravagant extent by Origen and his followers. It was not original with Swedenborg, but was derived by him from the early Christian fathers.

The Swedenborgians reject the Trinity, but believe that Christ was the Lord from heaven, the supreme ruler of the universe, in a visible form; and regard him as the only true God. They reject large and important portions of the Scriptures, comprehending Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and all the epistolary parts of the New Testament. They also reject the atonement; and suppose that Christ died to subjugate the powers of darkness, and deliver men from their dominion. This they derive from the ancient Gnostics. They believe in Swedenborg as the divinely-appointed minister and founder of the New church doctrines, and receive his visions and supposed conversations with spirits, as undoubted realities.

The Swedenborgian polity is that of moderate Episcopacy. This happened in consequence of the first converts being from the church of England. Swedenborg adopted no polity, and organized no church. This was done by his followers. His church of England disciples first organized as a separate body, and naturally chose the Episcopal system of organization, in conformity with their previous views of church polity. Their clergy are of three orders. 1, Bishops; 2, Pastors and ministers; 3, Assistant ministers; and they are governed by conventions, associations, and conferences.

Their associations consist of the ministers in a certain district, together with lay delegates from the churches, and have a general oversight of the churches in the district. The lay delegates have no voice in the determination of doctrinal matters. Conventions are a kind of general associations, consisting of clerical and lay delegates from the associations. The bishops preside

in the associations and conventions, ordain ministers, institute new churches, and have a general oversight of the church. Ministers have charge of local churches, preach and administer the sacraments. Assistant ministers also preach, and are analogous to deacons in the Episcopal churches. The Swedenborgians use a liturgy in public worship, which their ministers may dispense with at their discretion. They publish several periodicals devoted to the advancement of their order. Their ministers in the United States are estimated at forty or fifty, their churches at about thirty, and their membership at five thousand.

2. *The Latter-Day Saints.*

The first church of the Latter-day Saints was organized in the State of New York, April 6, 1830. It was founded by Joseph Smith, on what was pretended to be a new revelation, entitled the Book of Mormon. This book was claimed to have been dug up out of the earth, and to have been certified by an angel. Its certification was attested by several witnesses, whose testimony is appended to the book for the purpose of commending it to the general confidence of mankind, and Mormonism was preached as the last and highest development of true religion. Smith, generally called Joe Smith, was assisted by several others in publishing his new revelation, and commending it to the general attention. His system was a modification of Christianity, by conforming it to some of the principles and usages of corrupt Judaism, and by settling some debated points in agreement with the views of the Baptists, to which its founders appear to have been partial. Some disciples were soon gained, and a community organized. The most extravagant expectations, were encouraged in respect to the temporal and spiritual blessings to be gained in this new organization. The world was to be renovated, poverty and want banished from the ranks of the faithful, and a new order of things to be commenced, conformable to the most glowing pictures of ancient prophecy. These

blessings were not realized at first; but they were kept constantly in view, as just ahead.

The government of this new sect was hierarchical and despotic in the highest degree. The hierarchy consists of two orders of priests; 1, the Melchisedec or high-priesthood; 2, the Aaronic or lesser priesthood. Three high priests form a presidency, and twelve a high-council, denominated the twelve apostles. They have also three seventies, each consisting of a body of seventy elders, whose business is to travel and preach the Gospel throughout the world. The authority of the priests is absolute, and the system is one of the most absolute despotisms in existence. They have, in many cases, claimed the power of performing miracles, and in other particulars encouraged the wildest delusion and fanaticism, in their community.

Their leaders were ignorant, uncultivated men, men of narrow views, low and grovelling tastes, and sordid aims. They were charged, at different times, with gross and disgusting vices, and in many cases exercised their power in a most cruel and unprincipled manner, to oppress malcontents and dissenters, in their communion. Their primitive communities in Ohio and Illinois were objects of great displeasure and detestation to their neighbors, and, after experiencing great annoyance, they were obliged to emigrate from those states to positions farther west.

One of the first centres of Mormonism was at Kirtland, Ohio. Obliged to leave this place, on account of the great hostility that was excited against them in 1834, they afterwards attempted, in vain, to establish themselves in Jackson county, Missouri. In 1838, being expelled from Missouri, they passed over into Illinois, and established themselves in Nauvoo, in a strong position, on the banks of the Mississippi. They were now about fifteen thousand strong, and had missionaries propagating their faith in different parts of the United States and of Europe. New revelations had continued to be made to the Mormon leaders, according to the emergencies that arose. They fell into no strait or difficulty without having some special reve-

lation to help them out. Smith now called, by the divine authority, all the faithful to assemble at Nauvoo, and there build up a commonwealth of their own. Thousands responded to the call, and the new city, with a gorgeous temple, went briskly forward. The foundations of the temple were laid with great pomp in 1841. Prosecuted with great vigor, the Mormon interest had great success, and every year added to the wealth and population of Nauvoo. In 1844, Smith offered himself for the presidency of the United States. In Nauvoo he reigned supreme, and opposition was put down in the most summary manner.

Intoxicated with his success, in July, 1843, he ventured on a revelation authorizing him, and all whom he should allow, to take an unlimited number of wives; and to discard their existing wives, if they should object to admit a partnership in that relation. This was first acted upon privately, and communicated only to the more advanced divisions of the sect. In 1853, after the lapse of ten years, the veil of concealment was removed, and polygamy was boldly declared to be one of the blessings and privileges of the faithful. The pretended prophet attained unlooked for success, and great numbers from the lower classes of Europe embraced his principles and joined his cause. But divisions arose among his followers. Women whom Smith and his apostles had attempted to seduce, testified against them, and general discontent and distrust were abroad. Among other things, an opposition paper was started, and many things published which were highly discreditable to the Mormon leaders, and calculated to excite the general indignation against them. This was attempted to be suppressed by violence, which brought the Mormon leaders into collision with the authorities of the state. Smith had an armed and well-drilled force of four thousand men; but, this not being a match for the eighty thousand militia of the state, not to speak of the combined forces of the United States, he and the other leaders adopted the policy of prudence as the better part of valor, and surrendered themselves

to the authorities of the state, on a pledge of the governor, that their personal safety should be secured from mob violence. The state of exasperation was extreme, and the lives of these men were in imminent peril.

They were committed to prison in the county jail at Carthage, and a small body of troops stationed about the prison for their defence. But, unfortunately, the defence was insufficient. A powerful armed mob was soon collected, the guard of the prison was overpowered, and Joseph Smith and his brother both killed. The world has seen few examples of greater profligacy and knavery, connected with daring imposture and successful schemes of self-aggrandizement and power. Joseph Smith was a man of much more than ordinary natural abilities, and, had he been a wise and good man, and a man of high intellectual and moral cultivation, might have enrolled himself among the benefactors of his race. But he was a man of low and sordid tastes, the slave of sensuality and lust, and a base and vile schemer to exalt himself, and build up a religious community, on principles at war with the glory of God, and the true dignity and happiness of the human race. A more impious and reckless impostor never lived. Dishonorable as his end was to his country and to the cause of public order, it was richly deserved by his audacious wickedness. From the commencement of his imposture till his death, was fourteen years. During this time he had suffered bankruptcy at Kirtland, Ohio, and involved himself and his followers in great pecuniary embarrassment and distress; but, with this exception, his career had been generally prosperous. Smith's death was on June 27, 1844.

After the death of Smith, the leaders of the Mormon community resolved, June, 1846, to emigrate to a more ample and secure position, in the vicinity of the Rocky Mountains. It was evident that they could never carry out their views in Illinois. Indeed, they were subject to continual annoyance from their unbelieving neighbors, and long before they had made com-

plete arrangements to move from the state, their expulsion was accomplished by a military force.

They started for their more western home, in the wilderness, in the fall of 1846; and spent the winter of 1846 and 1847 on the banks of the Missouri, in the edge of the vast wilderness which they were about to explore. It was a winter of great suffering, and of great mortality. But spring came at last, and, out of twenty thousand people that had been broken up at Nauvoo, they mustered about three thousand to march to the land of promise in the deepest recesses of the wilderness. Their march was conducted in strict order, and was accomplished with as little sacrifice of life as might be. On arriving at the country of the Salt Lake, since called Utah, where a picked company had preceded them and had determined to locate, they stopped and settled. They had been joined by other adventurers, swelling their number to about four thousand. They immediately commenced the cultivation of the land with great industry, but their utmost efforts barely saved them from starvation the first winter. Since then, they have enjoyed great prosperity, and are in the constant receipt of large additions from different parts of the north of Europe. In 1850 the Mormon country was constituted into a territorial government of the United States, with the name of Utah. Its population at that time was eleven thousand three hundred and eighty.

According to present prospects, the country will reach sixty thousand, the number required to secure its admission as a state, in 1859.

JUN 2 6 1934